

MANUAL
OF
PATROLOGY
AND
HISTORY OF THEOLOGY

BY
F. CAYRÉ, A. A.

TRANSLATED BY
H. HOWITT, A. A., B. A.

FIRST VOLUME
FIRST & SECOND BOOKS

SOCIETY OF ST JOHN THE EVANGELIST

Desclée & Co.

Printers to the Holy See and the Sacred Congregation of Rites

PARIS, TOURNAI, ROMA

1936

Printed in Belgium

Nihil obstat.

Guillelmus Can. Collingwood, η. D.

Censor deputatus.

Nottinghamiæ die 1a Decembris 1935.

Nihil obstat.

R. Michel,

Can., libr. cens.

Imprimatur.

Tornaci, die 24 Decembris 1935.

J. Lecouvet, Vic. Gen.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

(English translation of “ Précis de Patrologie et d'Histoire de Théologie ”, copyrighted 1927 by Desclée & Co, Paris.)

PREFACE

Under the general heading of the *History and teaching of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church*, the author proposes to bring together in a single work brief but exact elements of

1. Patristic History and Literature;
2. History of Dogmas and Positive Theology;
3. History and Principles of Spirituality.

Such an arrangement has seemed necessary for two reasons; a priest's work today makes it essential that he should have some acquaintance with all these matters, and it is no less needful that he should have access to them in some concise form; in addition, a work of this kind appears to be well fitted to solve the difficulty of teaching these subjects in the Seminary Course, which is already overloaded with matters.

This Manual is primarily meant for the use of seminary students; but it will undoubtedly be found to be a useful work of reference to parish priests and university students. Nor should it fail to be of interest to the laity, especially those who are accustomed to public speaking on religious matters. The work has been written, however, above all and directly, for the future priest, the theological student in the seminary or study house.

A work meant for this class of reader must comply with certain special conditions. Nowadays a short introduction to the rigorous method which should guide all historical study, is an indispensable element in any complete and general course of studies, and such is provided in great measure by a course of Patrology, which, at the same time correlates and classifies the work of scholars, especially those of the

last fifty years, in the important field of early Christian literature. But while purely critical data should claim a great deal of attention from scholars and university students who are training themselves for personal research, we hold that they should be curtailed and reduced to a certain minimum in the case of seminary students and give way to more general doctrinal notions. In order that profit may be derived from reading the Fathers it is not enough to have studied their works only from a literary and critical point of view ; there is a risk of understanding them but poorly if the student's attention is restricted only to the principal points dealt with by each of the Fathers, and to their solutions of the great problems of their own day. After having situated the historical background the student must determine the doctrinal environment and observe the place occupied by each Father and the part he plays therein. This can hardly be achieved if a parallel study of the History of Doctrines is not added to the literary study of the texts.

In the seminary, these complementary matters will necessarily be treated in an elementary way, since they cover so wide a field ; but this will render them no less useful, both to future specialists and all theological students who will appreciate the significance of the texts cited in support of various dogmas, only after having located them in their general historical background. Moreover, not only the research worker, but also the new priest has need to study the actual text of the Fathers, not necessarily as a scholar but as a man capable of appreciating their doctrinal value, with a view to the spiritual profit of himself and of those whom it his duty to instruct; and this is hardly possible in the absence of a special preparation.

Only a manual can provide this training to big groups of students, with the precision and depth that

the subjects exact. But no matter how concise and complete be the manual, it does not do away with intellectual effort; rather does it facilitate and guide the grouping together of the essential data of the work to be accomplished. We have sought in vain for a manual which would fulfil the conditions we have set out, and it is for this reason we have been led to undertake the composition of this present work.

There exist, of course, excellent works, even in manual form, dealing with the Fathers of the Church. Birdenhever's *Patrology* is a classic, but it treats too exclusively of the literary and critical aspect of the subject. The same must be said of Tixeront's *Précis de Patrologie*, written in a rather elementary fashion. On the other hand, the same author's *Histoire des Dogmes*, in three volumes, is too voluminous to be termed a manual and needs the addition of another work to supplement it from an historical and literary point of view.

In addition to these volumes there is another series of works indispensable to the student and which he should always have near at hand. These are the collections of texts contained in the *Enchiridia* (see the General Bibliography). These anthologies are of the greatest value; but they have never been regarded as manuals of Patrology. Far from taking the place of the *Manual* they show its necessity, for the manual alone can merge all these texts into their historical, literary, and above all, doctrinal background.

In this work, *moral theology* and *spirituality* will be linked up with the history of doctrines. This point has suffered too much neglect ever since the theologians, faced with the urgent need of combating the Protestant error, turned their attention almost wholly to the affirmation of dogma as found in the Fathers. More recently, however, it has attracted the interest of both ascetics and historians. Pourrat has already

devoted three volumes to the subject (*La Spiritualité chrétienne*) and still another would be necessary to treat adequately of the last three centuries. The first volume alone deals with the Fathers' spiritual teaching. This work, in spite of omissions unavoidable in one of its length, is of the greatest usefulness, especially as regards its bibliography and the texts quoted. The author himself likens it to a kind of *Enchiridion spirituale*, although, in many ways this anthology differs from those we have already mentioned. It is evident that such a work, with its four volumes, can hardly be regarded as a manual.

We have attempted to fill this gap, not by seeking to say all that can be said on so vast a subject, but by throwing into relief, *the principles of spirituality* that are found in all the great Masters and which have been a source of inspiration to others. Although, in reality, all teach the same doctrine, the multiplicity of viewpoints often prevents this from being really apparent; for the most part, it is only necessary to know their teaching on a number of capital points in order to discover the real sameness underlying the superficial divergencies. We have gone to Saint Augustine, whose genius dominates every century of Christian antiquity, for those principles which give unity to our opinions in these delicate matters, and which, in an even greater measure, reveal how the spiritual works of the Fathers come together in a higher unity. We have gone still farther, and have, at times, appealed to their mystical teaching to throw light on their theological work. And in reality, for many of the Fathers, the latter cannot be fully understood if it is isolated and cut off from the former. This point of view has been especially developed with regard to the Alexandrians, and above all Saint Augustine. In our opinion, to attempt the study of these authors considered only as philosophers or theologians is to

imi the risk of laying oneself open to grave shortcomings and perhaps error. Saint Augustine's mystical temperament gives even to his philosophical and theological teaching a special tone which must be taken into account, and the same may be said of many other authors.

The work of synthesis we have endeavoured at least to trace, possesses another advantage. The fathers are not presented to the reader from a single and exclusive point of view. The historian usually treats of their exterior activity and the general influence they have exercised; the theologian and philosopher, each in his own domain, treats their works from a literary or doctrinal viewpoint, while the ascetic and mystical writers concentrate only on their interior life and mystical teaching. We have combined all these points of view, with the result, we dare to hope, that the figures of these true sons of the Church will become clearer and more brilliant, while at the same time their influence will be increased. Thus, without extraordinary effort, thanks to the method we have adopted, this present work provides a powerful aid to the general training of priests, which is the purpose of the Seminary.

Many have judged a synthesis of this nature to be chimerical. We do not deny the difficulties, but the beauty of the results that might ensue encouraged us to attempt it, and it has appeared possible in certain conditions, in a work not meant for specialists engaged in deep research. Aiming at the instruction of Christians, the training of the clergy, and not the guidance of personal work, we have only to give the conclusions of scholars who enjoy a recognised authority in their special subjects, and we are thus enabled to pass, with them, from one point to another. Moreover, even the simple comparison of the various solutions is in itself instructive; for it adds to each

solution a certain measure of confirmation, or occasionally suggests certain reservations that must be made. This method, the only one possible in a work of this nature, is a guarantee of sure results, in the measure that the conclusions reached by human knowledge can be certain.

It seemed to us that a work planned on these lines should go beyond the strictly Patristic period. The solid intellectual training we envisaged for the Christian and the priest, seemed to indicate a work in which they could also find those masters who have transmitted the thought and ideas of the Fathers to new generations.

It cannot be gainsaid that the great theologians of the Middle Ages or the Modern Period, especially those of the 11th to the 16th century, are, on the whole, consulted and read to a greater extent than the Fathers themselves. Their technical expressions and systematic classification of doctrines render them more easy of access to most readers. Among them is found, by the side of Saint Anselm, Saint Bonaventure, Blessed Duns Scot and many others, whose opinions are continually being cited, the *Angel of the School*, whom the Church has imposed as the guide of theological students. Similarly, are not Saint Bernard, Saint Teresa, Saint Francis of Sales, to mention but the greatest, the authors who have truly directed and maintained the spiritual life of souls for many centuries?

Without in any way desiring to write a connected history of theology or spirituality, we deemed it necessary and useful to bring together, with regard to these masters of modern Christian thought, as had been done for the Fathers, summary but nevertheless varied and precise data, which would enable the priest, and any educated Catholic, to read the originals with profit. The fourth book we intend to

the vote to this complementary study will not be merely an appendix to the Patrology, having but a secondary and tenuous connection with the first three: it will really form a continuation. Moreover, if a better realisation of the very real continuity of these great Christian thinkers of this period, increases their authority, the importance of the Fathers will also be augmented in the eyes of the Christian who is able to see in them the secret, but true inspirers of all the doctors of later times. We were able, therefore, and in a certain measure were bound, to continue our "Patrology" as far as that. It may be, even, that some will regard this last part as still more necessary than the first.

*
* *

In order to carry out our plan, we have been obliged to give to some authors an outstanding place, proportionate to their importance, either real, as arising from the intrinsic value of their work, or relative, as resulting from special circumstances; for instance, the absence of other contemporary documents on a question: such is the case of Hermas in the second century. It will also be noticed that the chapters are of unequal length, and we have purposely arranged them thus. The figures in a picture cannot all be on the same plane. We have endeavoured to throw into relief the great figures of Christianity, especially those whose influence has been felt in several centuries both in the sphere of doctrine and that of action. Others though not omitted take a lesser place: the account which is devoted to them will suffice to make them known, while their action and teaching in most cases gains from the reflection of the light of the great doctors of their times. Research workers have need above all to document themselves on the most obscure points, even should

these be the least important. But in a work of this nature, we must give our attention to the most important authors, with whom Christians as a whole, and Theological students should be intimately acquainted.

In the actual development of the chapters we have made no attempt to say everything there is to be said. There again, it was necessary to make a *choice*. We have omitted secondary points which seemed little suited to our purpose, both in the historical and literary, as well as the theological and spiritual order. We have however, given *biographical details* at a certain length, judging that the story of a life, even briefly presented, often constitutes the best possible portrait of a man. The list of authentic *works* is always given, although only the most important are summarised at length. As for the *doctrine*, we have dealt only with the essential points or those which seem best to characterise a man or a period. Our preoccupation with the general training of priests, which has often guided us in the choice of subject, has not, we think, ever biased us in the adoption of any solution to a disputed historical problem, nor have we hesitated in stating a so-called critical opinion, when it seemed sufficiently established.

We have taken especial care with our *bibliographies*. In this work will be found: i. A general bibliography at the head of the volume; 2. A special bibliography for each author, at the beginning of the chapter in which he is studied, except in certain cases; 3. reference to an edition (as recent as possible) for all the authors mentioned or studied in this work. But here again, no attempt has been made to be complete. It would have been easy to lengthen the lists, but such additions would have been of little use to our readers. We have thought it our duty to make a choice in their interest. In addition to the usual *editions*,

Migne's, and when necessary, more recent editions, have given the elements of a first documentation. As a rule we refer the reader to a dictionary article, if such exists on the subject. The chief recent works on any author are mentioned and the list is completed. In references to shorter studies, articles in periodicals, or chapters of more general works concerning the most important points regarding each of the Fathers. For the most part these works of reference are in French, and it has been thought necessary to retain them in the English edition, since English literature on the subject is still extremely scanty. We have taken pains to ensure that this summary yet varied documentation should be without danger from a doctrinal point of view, by excluding non-Catholic authors from the bibliographies and mentioning them only with caution. We have, however, quoted rationalist authors in the notes; but as a rule we add judgments of their works written by Catholic critics.

Our "*Manual*" was planned in view of a course consisting of two lessons a week during four years, which is probably the maximum given anywhere to this subject. But it can be studied in much less time if only the great authors are dealt with, or if for each author the essentials alone are studied, or those parts which need explanation and possess a general doctrinal interest. The fairly comprehensive doctrinal indexes of which the matters are arranged according to the logical order of modern theology, will enable those who so desire, to study the work in the form of an elementary history of doctrine, by following, period by period, and author by author, the development of any particular point. But it seems to us that such a synthetic method, although of extreme interest, can be followed with profit only after a complete analytical study of the work as a whole.

We would be the first to admit that there are shortcomings in this work which we now offer to the public. We trust that the advice and recommendations of the professors will enable us to improve it. Nevertheless we believe that even in its present state it will be found of use. Above all, may it help our future priests to give new life to their ideal of the priesthood, in close contact with those men who were pre-eminently doctors, apologists, apostles, saints, in a word, true priests !

Scholasticate of Theology
of the Augustinians
of the Assumption,
Louvain.

On the Feast of St. Augustine,
August 28th. 1927.

CONTENTS OF THE 1st VOLUME

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. — Recent collections of Patristic texts	— — — —	xxxi.
II. — Collections of various studies	— — — —	xxxii.
A. — Collections of Monographs in separate volumes		xxxii.
B. — Dictionaries and Encyclopedias	— — — —	xxxi.
C. — Periodicals		xxxiii.
III. — Works of Reference and Enchiridia	xxxiii.
IV. — Biographical and literary notices	— — — —	xxxiv.
V. — Works dealing with the history of doctrines	xxxv.
A. — Recent general works on the history of dogma	xxxv.
B. — General studies on particular points	xxxv.
Introduction		1-29
I. — General notion of Patrology		1
II. — The object of Patrology		4
III. — General method and division.....		6
A. — General method		6
B. — General division of Patrology		7
C. — Subdivisions of Patrology properly so called	— — —	8
IV. — The importance of the study of the Fathers	10
V. — The text of the Fathers. Early collections	12
VI. — Studies on the Fathers		15
A. — Biographical and literary studies		15
B. — Studies on the history of dogma		17
VII. — Elementary notions of mystical theology	19
A. — Mysticism in general		19
B. — Contemplation		22
C. — Contemplative meditation		25
D. — Advantages of these distinctions		28

BOOK I.

THE ORIGINS OF PATRISTIC LITERATURE.

(First period: xst, 2nd and 3rd centuries).

FIRST PART.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

CHAPTER I. — The Apostolic Fathers in general	31-37
I. — Character of the Apostolic writings	-31
II. — The Doctrine of the Apostolic writings	-33

A. — The Trinitarian and Christological Doctrine	
B. — The Church	• 33
C. — Moral Teaching	• 35
	• 36
CHAPTER II. — The Apostles' Creed	37-42
I. — The Authority and the Text of the Apostles' Creed	
II. — History of the Creed in the West: its origins	• 37
III. — The Apostles' Creed in the East	• 39
	• 42
CHAPTER III. — The Didache	42-51
I. — History of the Didache — — — —	
II. — Abstract of the Didache — — — —	• 43
A. — The moral catechism — — — —	• 44
B. — The liturgical instruction — — — —	• 44
C. — Disciplinary regulations — — — —	• 45
D. — Epilogue: The Parousia — — — —	• 45
	• 46
III. — Doctrine of the Didache — — — —	• 46
A. — Dogma and moral	• 46
B. — Ecclesiastical Orders — — — —	• 47
C. — The Sacraments	• 49
D. — The Parousia	• Si
CHAPTER IV. — Saint Clement of Rome	52-61
I. — The Life and Work of Saint Clement	
A. — Life	• 52
B. — Works	• 53
II. — The Epistle to the Corinthians	• 55
A. — Date and authenticity — — — —	• 55
B. — Abstract	• 56
III. — The Teaching of the Epistle	• 57
A. — Ecclesiastical hierarchy — — — —	• 57
B. — The Roman Primacy — — — —	• 59
C. — The Spiritual life	• 61
CHAPTER V. — Saint Ignatius of Antioch	61-73
I. — Life of Saint Ignatius — — — —	• 62
II. — Works of Saint Ignatius — — — —	• 64
A. — Collections of his Letters — — — —	• 64
B. — Contents of his Letters — — — —	• 65
C. — St. Ignatius' style	• 66
III. — The Doctrine of Saint Ignatius' Epistles	• 66
A. — The hierarchical constitution of the Church	• 66
B. — The privileges of the Roman Church	• 67
C. — Christology	• 69
D. — The spiritual life	• 71
CHAPTER VI. — Saint Polycarp. The Presbyters. Papias	73-77
I. St. Polycarp. — Epistle to the Philippians. — Acts of his martyrdom.....	73

II. — The Presbyters.....	75
III. — Papias	76
CHAPTER VII. — Various Pseudepigraphal Writings .	78-82
I. — The Epistle attributed to St. Barnabas	78
II. — The Homily, called the Second Letter of St. Clement .	79
III. — The Two Letters to Virgins	81
CHAPTER VIII. — Hermas	83-96
I. — Hermas and his work	83
II. — Abstract of the Shepherd	85
A. — Visions	86
B. — Precepts	87
C. — Similitudes.....	87
III. — The Doctrine of the Shepherd	88
A. — State of Penance in the Church in the 2nd century .	88
B. — The teaching of Hermas on Penance	90
C. — Other doctrinal features.....	94

SECOND PART.

THE FATHERS OF THE END OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

CHAPTER I. — The Historical, Social and Intellectual Environment.....	97-107
I. — The Church and the Pagan State	97
II. — Judæo-Christianity.....	99
III. — Gnosticism.....	too
A. — Nature	too
B. — Doctrinal summary of Gnosticism.....	102
C. — History of Gnosticism — — — — —	103
D. — Marcionism	104
IV. — Montanism.....	105
V. — Millenarianism.....	106
VI. — Encratism.....	107
CHAPTER II. — The first Apologists of the 2nd century	107-114
I. — The Apologists in general — — — — —	108
II. — Quadratus.....	110
III. — Aristides.....	in
IV. — Aristo of Pella	112
V. — Epistle to Diognetus.....	113
CHAPTER III. — Saint Justin.....	114-129
I. — Life of Saint Justin.— His Character	i>4
II. — Works of Saint Justin.....	117
A. — General Description of his Works	i<7
B. — The Dialogue with Tryphon	n8
C. — The Apologies.....	l'9

III. — The Doctrine of Saint Justin	120
A. — Saint Justin, the Philosopher	
B. — The Theologian	124
C. — The Doctor of the Catholic Church.....	126
CHAPTER IV. — The last Apologists of the 2nd century	129-138
I. — Tatian	ij o
II. — Athenagoras	13 j
III. — Saint Theophilus of Antioch	133
IV. — Eastern Apologists whose works are lost, or are of lesser importance	134
V. — Minucius Felix	136
CHAPTER V. — The Controversialists of the 2nd century	138-140
I. — The controversialists in general	13g
II. — The chief controversialists of the 2nd century	139
CHAPTER VI. — Saint Irenaeus	141-153
I. — Life of St. Irenaeus	141
II. — Works of St. Irenaeus	144
III. — Doctrine of Saint Irenaeus	146
A. — The Rule of Faith	147
B. — The Trinity	148
C. — Christology	149
D. — Christian Spirituality	151
E. — The Last Things	153
CHAPTER VII. — Divers Secondary Writings. . . .	153-156
I. — Various letters	153
II. — The Epitaphs of Abercius and Pectorius	154
III. — The Canon of Muratorius	155
CHAPTER VIII. — Christian Apocryphal Literature .	156-165
I. — Apocryphal literature in general	156
II. — Apocryphal gospels	159
A. — The lost gospels	159
B. — Gospels of the Infancy	160
C. — Gospels concerning the deaths of Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph	162
III. — Apocryphal acts	163
IV. — Apocryphal letters and apocalypses	164
A. — Apocryphal letters	164
B. — Apocryphal apocalypses	165

THIRD PART.

THE FATHERS OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

CHAPTER I. — The Historical, Social and Intellectual Environment	166-176
I. — The Historical environment — general view	166
II. — Efforts to renew Paganism	167

A. — The oriental religions.....	137
B. — Neo-Platonism.....	
C. — Manichaeism.....	140
III. — Christian doctrinal environment. The Trinitarian Question	171
IV. — Errors regarding the Trinity	173
A. — Modalism.....	173
B. — Adoptianism.....	175
CHAPTER II. — Clement of Alexandria.	177-191
I. — Life and Character. The School of Alexandria	177
II. — Writings of Clement of Alexandria.....	180
A. — The "Outlines".....	180
B. — The Hortatory Discourse to the Greeks	180
C. — The Tutor.....	181
D. — The Trilogy of Clement.....	181
E. — Miscellanies.....	182
III. — The Doctrine of Clement of Alexandria — — — —	184
A. — Moral and mystical doctrine.....	185
B. — Theology in the work of Clement of Alexandria	188
CHAPTER III. — Origen.....	191-220
section I. — Life and Works.....	192
I. — Origen's life and character.....	192
II. — Works of Origen.....	195
A. — Scriptural works.....	196
B. — Non-scriptural works.....	197
section II. — Origen's doctrinal Method	201
I. — Mystical tendency.....	201
II. — Faith and reason in Origen's method.....	204
A. — Attachment to faith and tradition.....	204
B. — Philosophy.....	205
III. Origen's exegesis.....	206
A. — Principles of Origenist exegesis.....	208
B. — Advantages and dangers of the method — — — —	206
Section III. — Origen's doctrine.....	210
I. — General survey of Origen's theology.....	210
II. — Outstanding features of Origen's theology	211
A. — Defective teaching on the Trinity.....	211
B. — Other theological questions.....	214
III. Spiritual doctrine.....	216
A. — Mystical teaching.....	216
B. — The ascetic method.....	216
IV. — Origenism.....	217
A. — The beginnings of Origenism.....	217
B. — The Origenist controversies.....	218

CHAPTER IV. — Saint Hippolytus .	220-229
I. — Life of Saint Hippolytus. His Works .	220
A. — Sources of information regarding his life.	220
B. — Exegetical and controversial works .	221
C. — Personal controversies — — — — .	222
D. — Various other works.....	224
II. — The doctrine of Hippolytus. Edict of Callistu	226
A. — Trinitarian doctrine	226
B. — Penitential doctrine.....	227
CHAPTER V. — Tertullian	229-250
I. — Tertullian's Life and Character.	230
A. — Life	230
B. — Character	232
II. — Works of Tertullian.....	233
A. — Apologetical writings	234
B. — Controversial works.....	235
C. — Moral and disciplinary works .	239
D. — Works concerning sacramental discipline	241
III. — Doctrinal synthesis.....	245
A. — The theologian in general	245
B. — The Catholic theologian	247
C. — The Montanist theologian	249
CHAPTER VI. — Novatian	250-254
I. — Novatian the Catholic	250
II. — Novatianism .	250
CHAPTER VII. — Saint Cyprian — — — —	254-268
I. — Life and works until the middle of his episcopate	255
A. — Before the episcopate	
B. — Beginning of the episcopate — — — —	
II. — Episcopal controversy (251-258) and the writings of this period	258
A. — Penance. The Unity of the Church	258
B. — Relations with Rome. — Diverse initiatives	259
C. — The baptismal controversy	260
III. — Doctrine of Saint Cyprian .	262
A. — Synopsis of his works and doctrine .	262
B. — The Church	266
C. — The Sacraments	266
D. — Moral teaching.....	267
CHAPTER VIII. — The last writers in the West	269-275
I. — Commodianus.....	269
II. — Arnobius the Elder	270
III. — Lactantius.....	271
IV. — Saint Reticus of Autun — — — —	274
V. — Saint Victorinus of Pettau — — — —	274

CONTENTS OF THE 1st VOLUME.

CHAPTER IX. — The last Oriental writers of the third century.....	275-286
I. — Saint Dionysius of Alexandria — — — — —	• 275
A. — Life and works.....	• 275
B. — Doctrine.....	
II. — The last Alexandrian authors of the 3rd century	278
A. — At the Didascalia	278
B. — Others, not members of the Didascalia .	279
III. — Syrian authors.....	279
A. — In Palestine	279
B. — At Antioch	
IV. — Asiatic authors.....	
CHAPTER X. — Anonymous writings of the third century.....	287-290
I. — Eastern anonymous writings.....	• 287
A. — <i>De recta in Deum fide</i>	• 287
B. — The Didascalia Apostolorum.....	• 287
II. — Western anonymous writings.....	• 288
III. — The acts of the Martyrs	• 289

BOOK II. I

THE CENTURY OF THE GREAT FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

(Second period : from 300 to 430).

Introduction.....	• 291-309
I. — General outline. Division and character of fourth century Patristic literature — — — — —	291
II. — The social and intellectual environment .	293
A. — The Church and the State — — — — —	293
B. — The break-up of the Empire and Christian Unity	294
C. — Christian society	295
III. — Heresies in the fourth century — — — — —	295
A. — Trinitarian and Christological errors	295
B. — Other errors	296
IV. — Doctrinal movements. The Schools of Alexandria and Antioch.....	296
A. — The School of Alexandria.	297
B. — The School of Antioch	298
C. — Traditionalist School.....	300
V. — Doctrinal progress in the fourth century .	301
A. — Dogma	301
B. — Theology	302

VI. — Development of the doctrine regarding the Apostolic See.	303
A. — Outline of the question	303
B. — The Patriarchates	305
C. — The doctrine of the Apostolic See	306

FIRST PART.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE GREAT PATRISTIC CENTURY.

(From 300 to 360).

CHAPTER I. — Introduction. — Arianism	309-319
I. — The Arian controversies.....	309
A. — Under Constantine.....	309
B. — Under Constantius II and Constans — — — —	310
C. — Under Constantius II sole emperor	311
D. — After Constantius II — The triumph of the Nicene faith.	312
II. — Arius and his first followers.....	313
A. — Arius.	313
B. — Eusebius of Nicomedia.....	314
III. — Chief representatives of the Arian sects	315
A. — The Anomoeans — — — —	315
B. — The Homoeans.....	316
C. — Homoiousians or Semi-Arians	317
D. — Arian historians — — — —	318
CHAPTER II. — Eusebius of Caesarea — — — —	318-327
I. — Life and Character of Eusebius	319
A. — Life	319
B. — Character	320
II. — The works of Eusebius	322
A. — Historical works	322
B. — Scriptural works	324
C. — Apologetical and theological writings — — — —	325
D. — Sermons and letters.....	326
CHAPTER III. — Chief defenders of the Nicene Faith	327-335
I. — In the East	327
A. — Saint Alexander of Alexandria.....	327
B. — Saint Eustathius of Antioch	328
C. — Marcellus of Ancyra.....	330
II. — In the West	331
A. — Orthodox defenders.....	331
B. — Lucifer of Cagliari and his followers.....	332
C. — Liberius	333
CHAPTER IV. — Saint Athanasius.....	336-354
I. — Life of Saint Athanasius. His Character	336

A. — Under Constantine. Beginnings of the episcopate	336
B. — Life of St. Athanasius under Constantius II	338
C. — Last years.....	341
I). — Character of St. Athanasius.....	343
II. — Works of St. Athanasius.....	344
A. — Controversial works.....	344
B. — Doctrinal treatises.....	345
C. — Exegesis and Spirituality.....	346
D. — Letters	347
E. — Doubtful or apocryphal works.....	348
III. — The doctrine of Skint Athanasius.....	349
A. — Cenerai outline of his doctrine.....	349
B. — Fundamental points of his doctrine.....	350
C. — Spirituality.	353
CHAPTER V. — Saint Hilary of Poitiers	354-364
I. — Life and Character.....	355
II. — Works	358
A. — Works dealing with the Arian controversies	358
B. — Other writings of St. Hilary.....	359
III. — Doctrine of Saint Hilary.....	360
A. — Outline of his doctrine.....	360
B. — Doctrine on the Trinity.....	361
C. — Christology	363
CHAPTER VI. — St. Cyril of Jerusalem and various other authors.....	364-374
I. — Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (313-386).....	364
A. — His life, and the authority of his teaching	364
B. — The Catecheses and their sacramental teaching	367
II. — Divers other authors. Opponents of Manichaeism	369
III. — Anonymous disciplinary writings.....	371
A. — Collections of canons	371
B. — Great canonical compilations.....	373
CHAPTER VII.— Saint Ephraem and Syriac Literature in the fourth century.....	375-385
I. — Syriac literature before Saint Ephraem — — — —	375
A. — Authors who wrote previous to the 4th century	375
B. — Beginning of the 4th century. — Aphraates	376
II. — Saint Ephraem.....	378
A. — Life and character.....	378
B. — Works	380
C. — Doctrine	382
III. — Syriac Catholic literature after St. Ephraem	385

SECOND PART.

THE CLIMAX OF THE GREAT PATRISTIC CENTURY.

(From 361 to 430).

CHAPTER I. — Preliminary outline. The heresies	386-394
I. — Preliminary outline.....	386
A. — Main characters of this period.....	386
B. — Division of the Second Part	388
II. — Donatism and Pelagianism	389
A. — Donatism.....	389
B. — Pelagianism	391

FIRST SECTION.

CHAPTER II. — Saint Epiphanius.....	395-400
I. — Life and Character of Saint Epiphanius — — — —	395
A. — Life — — — — —	395
B. — Character.....	397
II. — Works and doctrine of Saint Epiphanius — — — —	398
A. — Works	398
B. — Doctrine	399
CHAPTER III. — Didymus the Blind — — — —	400-406
I. — Life and Character.....	401
II. — Works	402
A. — Exegesis.....	402
B. — Theological works.....	403
III. — Doctrine	404
A. — Theology.....	404
B. — Spirituality	405
CHAPTER IV. — The Cappadocian Bathers . . .	406-447
Article I. — Saint Basil. Life and Works. . . .	406
I. — Life of Saint Basil. His Character.....	406
A. — Before the episcopate	406
B. — Episcopate.....	408
C. — Character.....	410
II. — Works of Saint Basil.....	411
A. — Ascetic works.....	411
B. — Homiletic works	413
C. — Dogmatic works	414
D. — Letters	415
Article II. — Saint Gregory of Nazianzus. Life and	
Works	415
I. — Life and Character.....	416

A. — Life before the episcopate.....	416
li. — Bishop of Constantinople	417
C. — Character.....	419
II — Works of Saint Gregory of Nazianzus	420
Article III. — Saint Gregory of Nyssa. Life and Works.....	423
I. — Life and Character.....	423
A. — Life.....	423
B. — Character.....	435
II. — Works of St. Gregory of Nyssa.....	426
A. — Theological writings.....	426
B. — Scriptural works.....	428
C. — Ascetic works.....	429
§). — Sermons and Letters.....	429
Article IV. — Saint Amphilocius of Iconium	430
Article V. — Teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers	431
I. — Sources of the teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers	432
A. — The Scriptures.....	432
B. — Tradition.....	433
II. — The Trinity.....	434
A. — The οὐσία and the ὁπόστασι	434
B. — The ὁμοούσιον	435
C. — The Holy Ghost.....	437
III. — Christ.....	438
A. — Christological teaching.....	439
B. — Soteriological teaching.....	439
IV. — The Church.....	440
V. — Grace and the Sacraments.....	442
A. — Grace.....	442
B. — Sacraments.....	443
VI. — Christian life.....	445
VII. — Eschatology.....	446
(CHAPTER V. — Apollinaris of Laodicea	447-452
I. — Life of Apollinaris. His Catholic works — — —	448
II. — The error of Apollinaris. His condemnation	449
III. — Apollinarianism. Doctrinal synopsis. The disciples of Apollinaris.....	451
(CHAPTER VI. — Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.....	452-460
I. — Diodorus of Tarsus.....	452
II. — Theodore of Mopsuestia.....	455
A. — Life of Theodore. Controversies centred around him after his death.....	455
B. — The exegesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia — — —	457
C. — The theology of Theodore.....	458

CHAPTER VII. — Saint John Chrysostom	460-493
Article I. — Life and Character	461
I. — Life until the episcopate (344-398).....	461
A. — Education. The Monk	461
B. — The Priest of Antioch	463
II. — Bishop of Constantinople.....	466
A. — Ministry. Pastoral activity	466
B. — Critical events in his episcopacy	467
III. — Exile (404-407). Character of St. John Chrysostom .	469
A. — Exile.....	469
B. — Character of St. John Chrysostom.....	471
Article II. — The Works of St. John Chrysostom	472
I. — Non-oratorical works.....	473
A. — Concerning the religious life	473
B. — Treatise on the Priesthood	474
C. — Various writings on education and chastity	476
D. — Writings in defence of religion or Providence	476
E. — Letters	477
II. — Oratorical works	477
A. — Sermons	478
B. — Homilies	480
III. — The Orator. Nature of his eloquence	481
Article III. — Teaching of St. John Chrysostom	483
I. — The doctor.....	483
II. — The moralist	486
III. — Teaching on Grace, the Sacraments and the Church	488
A. — Grace	488
B. — The Sacraments	489
C. — The Church	492
CHAPTER VIII. — Secondary Oriental Authors. Bishops and monks.....	494-499
I. — Bishops, friends or adversaries of St. John Chrysostom	494
II. — Other bishops, theologians and exegetes	495
III. — Bishop philosophers.....	496
IV. — Monastic exegetes	497
CHAPTER IX. — Oriental Monachism — — — —	499-512
I. — Outline of monachism. Historians of monachism	499
A. — General outline.....	499
B. — Lives of the Fathers of the Desert	500
C. — Palladius	501
II. — The monastic lawgivers	502
A. — Anchoretic life	502
B. — Coenobitic life	504

III. — Ascetic literature	• 5°5
IV. — Ascetic teaching. Brief outline	• 509
A. — The spiritual combat	• 509
B. — The weapons	• SU
C. — Victories	• 512
(CHAPTER X. — The Popes	513-519
I. — Saint Daniasus	• 5'3
II. — The first decretals of the popes in the 4th century	• 5'5
III. — Writings of the first popes in the 5th century	• 516
A. — Saint Innocent I (409-417) — — —	• 516
B. — The successors of Pope Innocent I	• 5'9
(CHAPTER XI. — Saint Ambrose — — —	520-547
I. — Life of St. Ambrose. Political influence	• 520
A. — Before the episcopate	• 520
B. — Episcopate: pastoral activity — — —	
C. — Episcopate: political influence	523
D. — Character	
II. — Works	528
A. — Scriptural works	«j28
B. — Moral works	531
C. — Dogmatic works	533
D. — Divers other writings	534
HI. — The doctrine of Saint Ambrose — — —	535
A. — The doctor of the independence and unity of Church	535
B. — Saint Ambrose, moralist	539
C. — Saint Ambrose, theologian — — —	544
(CHAPTER XII. — Christian Poets — — —	547-558
I. — Christian poetry in Italy	• 548
II. — Christian poetry in Gaul	• 550
A. — Various authors	• 550
B. — Saint Paulinus of Noia	• 55'
III. — Christian poetry in Spain. Prudentius	• 554
(CHAPTER XIII. — Historians and Chroniclers. Rufinus	558-569
I. — Sulpicius Severus	• 558
II. — Paulus Orosius	• 560
III. — Rufinus	• 562
A. — Life of Rufinus. The Origenist controversy	• 562
B. — Works of Rufinus	• 565
IV. — Divers historical documents — — —	• 567
A. — Accounts of pilgrimages	• 567
B. — The Chronographer of the year 354	• 568
t CHAPTER XIV. — Saint Jerome — — —	• 569-593
I. — Life and Character	• 570

A. — Preparation	570
B. — The solitary of Bethlehem. Works and controversies .	573
C. — Saint Jerome's character.....	579
II. — Works of Saint Jerome	580
A. — Works on the text of the Scriptures.....	580
B. — Scriptural studies	581
C. — Various other works.....	585
III. — The doctrine of Saint Jerome	587
A. — The doctor; his authority	587
B. — Special features of St. Jerome's teaching	591
CHAPTER XV. — Cassian.....	594-603
I. — Life and works of Cassian.....	594
A. — Life	594
B. — Works	595
II. — Spiritual doctrine	596
A. — Teaching on Perfection in general	597
B. — Teaching on Prayer.....	598
III. — Teaching on Grace	601
CHAPTER XVI. — Minor theologians and controversia-	
lists	603-611
I. — Nicetas of Remesiana	603
II. — Contemporaries of Saint Ambrose in Italy	604
A. — Famous bishops	604
B. — Ambrosiaster	605
III. — Saint Pacianus	606
IV. — Priscillian. His friends and foes	606
V. — Saint Optatus of Melevis	608
VI. — Friends and disciples of St. Augustine in Africa	610
CHAPTER XVII. — Saint Augustine — — — —	612-716
Article I. — Life and Controversial Works	614
I. — Life before baptism (354-387).....	614
A. — The fall	615
B. — The ascent	616
C. — The neophyte	618
II. — Life after baptism (387-430). General outline	620
III. — The fight against Manichaeism.....	622
IV. — The fight against Donatism	625
V. — The fight against Pelagianism.....	630
A. — First phase (411-418).....	630
B. — Second phase (419-430).....	633
VI. — Last years. Death of Saint Augustine — — — —	637

ARTICLE II. — NON-CONTROVERSIAL WORKS	• 638
I. — The Confessions	• 638
II. — Philosophical Dialogues	• 640
III. — Saint Augustine's theological and apologetical works	• 643
A. — Writings on the foundations of religion	• 644
B. — Treatise on the Trinity	• 645
C. — The City of God	• 648
D. — The Enchiridion and moral works — — — —	• 650
IV. — Pastoral works : exegesis, preaching	• 653
A. — Works of a theoretical nature	• 653
B. — Exegesis	• 654
C. — Preaching	• 656
V. — Letters—Retractations—Apocryphal works	• 659
Article III. — The doctor	• 660
I. — The man and the saint	• 660
A. — The man	• 660
B. — The contemplative	• 662
C. — The optimism of Saint Augustine — — — —	• 664
II. — Saint Augustine's doctrinal method — — — —	• 665
A. — Authority	• 665
B. — Reason	• 666
C. — The heart	• 668
III. — Augustinian theology	• 669
A. — Notion of theology	• 669
B. — Characteristics	• 670
Article IV. — Doctrine	• 672
I. — God. The Man-God	• 672
A. — Existence and nature — — — —	• 672
B. — Trinitarian doctrine	• 674
C. — The work of God	• 676
D. — The Man-God	• 676
II. — Man. Grace	• 678
A. — Man	• 678
B. — Justification. Sanctifying grace — — — —	• 680
C. — Actual grace	• 681
D. — Mystic graces	• 686
III. — Predestination	• 688
A. — Brief outline. Difficulties	• 688
B. — The Augustinian point of view	• 690
C. — Advantages and disadvantages — — — —	• 694
IV. — Moral and ascetic teaching	• 695
A. — The moralism of Saint Augustine — — — —	• 695
B. — Fundamental elements of Augustinian moral teaching	• 698
C. — Augustinian ascetic teaching	• 701

V. — The Church and the Sacraments	703
A. — The Church	703
B. — The sacraments	707
VI. — The last things.....	711
Concl u s i o n	713

INDEXES.

Alphabetical index to authors' names	717-721
Doctrinal index	722-740
I. — Patristic data for the introduction to theology .	• 722
A. — General data	• 722
B. — Holy Scripture I	• 723
C. — Tradition	• 724
D. — Apologetics and controversy — — — —	• 725
E. — Doctrinal errors combated by the early Fathers	• 725
II. — Patristic data concerning faith (Dogma) .	• 727
A. — God, His nature and His work	• 727
B. — The Trinity	• 728
C. — Christ. Our Lady. The Saints	• 729
D. — Grace	• 731
E. — The Church	• 732
F. — The sacraments	• 734
G. — The last things.....	• 735
III. — Patristic data concerning Christian Life .	• 736
A. — Moral theology.....	• 736
B. — Ascetic theology	• 738
C. — Pastoral theology. Discipline — — — —	• 739
IV. — Alphabetical index to the doctrinal index .	• 740

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY I.

I.—RECENT COLLECTIONS OF PATRISTIC TEXTS.

The *early collections*, until Migne's inclusively, are mentioned below in the *traduction*, p. 12-15.

Migne's *Greek* and *Latin* Patrologies are quoted in the abbreviated form : P. L.;—P. G. The volume is shown by the Arabic figure in thick type « liich follows immediately.

A) Collections which supplement Migne: *Patrologia syriaca*, by I. GRAFFIN, Paris, 189459., 2 vol. (Abbreviated to: Pat. syr.).

Patrologia orientalis, by R. Graffin and F. Nau, Paris, 1903 and sq.; more extensive continuation of the foregoing. (Abbreviated: P. O.).

Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, by J. B. CHABOT, I. Guidi, II. Ilyvernati, B. Carra de Vaux, Paris 1903 and sq.; like the foregoing : irk is an edition of *Syriac*, *Arabic*, *Coptic* and *Ethiopian* texts. (Abbrev. : Corp. Orient.).

Anecdota Maredsolana, by Dom G. Morin, Maredsous, 1892 and sq.

B) The following collections not only supplement Migne's by means of new editions but also completely *revise his work* from a more critical standpoint.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, edited by the Academy of Vienna, since 1866; Latin text only. (Abbrev. : Corpus of Vienna).

Monumenta germaniæ historica, Auctores antiquissimi, Berlin, 1877-1898, 13 vol. (Abbrev. : Mon. ger. hist. or Mon. Berlin.).

Die Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei lahrhunderte, edited by the Academy of Berlin at Leipzig, since 1897, critical editions without h.inslations. (Abbrev. : Corp. Beri, or Corpus of Berlin.).

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der allchristlicken Literatur, llection directed by the Academy of Leipzig, first series 1882-1897, 15 vols; i cond series, 1897-1906, 15 vols; third series (A. Harnack and C. Schmidt) 1907 and sq. (Abbrev. : Text. Unters.).

Texts and Studies, O. A. Robinson. Cambridge, 1891 and sq. (Abbrev. : Text Stud.).

Note. — These last two collections as the titles indicate, are not only editions of texts; they also contain *research work* and *studies* on early Christian literature.

C) Little collections *especially adapted to students* desirous of making first acquaintance with early Christian literature:

Textes et Documents pour l'étude historique au christianisme, by H. Hemmel and P. Lejay, Paris, since 1904; gives texts with translation, introduction and notes. (Abbrev. : Text. Docum.j.

SS. Patrum opuscula selecta, by H. Hurter, Innsbruck, First series, 1X118-1885, 48 vols; 2nd series 1884-1892, 6 vols.

Sammlung ausgewdhltter k. u. d. Quellenschrijten, by G. Krüger, Tübingen : series 1891-1896, 12 fascicules; 2nd series, since 1901.

Kleine Texte, II. Lietzmann, Bonn, since 1902.

Florilegium patristicum, G. Rauschen, Bonn, since 1904.

Cambridge Patristic texts, A. Mason, Cambridge, since 1899.

Bibliotheca sanctorum Patrum, J. Vizzini, Rome, since 1902.

¹ Works anterior to the second half of the 19th century, which are studied or mentioned in the *Introduction* (p. 12 sq.), are not cited in this bibliography.

II.—COLLECTIONS OF VARIOUS STUDIES.

(In French, excepted otherwise stated).

A) Collections of monographs in separate volumes.

Les Saints (Paris, Lecoffre), a series of *lives*, written chiefly from an historical point of view. (*English translations*, The Saints Series, Burns Oates & Washbourne).

The Bibliothèque de l'enseignement de l'histoire ecclésiastique (*Ibid.*) contains various monographs of a literary, doctrinal and historical nature (for instance *La littérature grecque* by Mgr P. Batiffol (literary); the *Histoire des Dogmes*, by J. Tixeront (doctrinal); the *Eglise Byzantine*, by Fr. J. Pargoire (historical). (Abbrev.: coll. B. E. H. E.).

The Pensée chrétienne (Paris, Bloud), gives numerous “*Extracts*, translated and annotated, interspersed with brief abstracts, and preceded as a rule by bibliographical and biographical introductions. It contains a group of *Patristic* texts as well as *biblical*, *scholastic* and *modern* texts. (Abbrev.: coll. Pensée chrét.).

The Bibliothèque de théologie historique, published under the direction of *professors of theology at the Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris, Beauchesne) contains a number of very important doctrinal monographs. (Abbrev.: coll. B. T. H.).

The Etudes de théologie historique, forming a continuation of the preceding, contains similar works. (Abbrev.: coll. E. T. H.).

Science et Religion, a series of pamphlets on various religious subjects; some deal with the history of doctrine, or the Fathers, especially in the special series (*Questions théologiques*, etc...).

The Moralistes chrétiens (Texts and Commentaries) plans to bring together the texts of each author studied, in order to form a synthesis of his moral teaching.

B) The following Dictionaries or Encyclopedias, written by many collaborators, contain series of *monographs*, usually fairly brief, sometimes running to considerable length. They invariably include detailed *bibliographies* and the elements of a first documentation.

The Dictionnaire de la Bible, by F. Vigouroux, 1893-1912. A supplement is published by L. PIROT, since 1926. (Abbrev.: Diet. Bibl.).

The Dictionnaire de théologie catholique, published since 1903 by A. Vacant, and then by E. Mangenot, and lastly by E. Amann. (Abbrev.: Diet. théol.).

The Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie, published by Dom F. Carrol and Dom H. Leclercq, since 1907. (Abbrev.: Diet Arch.).

The Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastique, published by A. Baudriliart, A. Vogt and U. Rouzifes, since 1912. (Abbrev.: Diet. hist.).

These four dictionaries, published by the same publisher (Ixitouzey, Paris), undoubtedly constitute our *greatest Encyclopedia of ecclesiastical sciences*. To these should be added:

The Dictionnaire apologétique de la Foi Catholique, published by P. A. D'Alès, since 1911 (Paris, Beauchesne). (Abbrev.: Diet. Apol.).

Germany has its catholic Encyclopedia in the form of the Kirchenlexicon, published Wetzler and Welte, from 1846 to 1856 at Freiburg; re-edited and greatly augmented by J. Hergenrother and later by F. Kaulen, from 1880 to 1921, in 12 vols.

The Realencyklopadie of Protestant theology and the Protestant Church (1st ed. 1854-1866, 21 vols.; 3rd ed. 1896-1910) contains some sound studies but cannot be recommended to Seminary students for obvious reasons.

Catholic Encyclopedia, an American compilation in 17 vols. 1907-1912, is much less complete than the *Diet, theol.*, provides a useful source of material, even for the History of the Church and the Fathers.

A Dictionary of Christian Biography (Literature, sects and doctrines) by V. SMITH and H. Wack, London, 1877-1887, 4 vols; a Protestant work. It contains good monographs and may be consulted with profit by those who can do so without risk.

Periodicals to be consulted regarding the Fathers.

1. *Periodicals* containing many articles on the Fathers:

I. *Analecta bollandiana*, since 1882, Brussels-Paris.

I. *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'Archéologie chrétiennes*, by P. de L. sbl. u. i. E, Paris, since 1911.

[*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique*, Institut catholique de Toulouse. '899-

[*Echos d'Orient*, Assumptionists, Constantinople, since 1897.

I. *Le Muséon*, Revue of Oriental Studies, Louvain, since 1881.

I. *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, Soc. Jesu, Paris, since 1910.

[*Revue bénédictine*, Benedictines of Maredsous, since 1884 (under the title: *K. Messenger des fidèles*, from 1884-1889).

I. *Revue biblique*, Dominicans, Jerusalem, since 1892.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, University of Louvain, since 1900.

I. *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, Paris, 1896-1907; A. Loisy's *Irvin*; many articles are biased and should be read with caution.

I. *Revue néo-scholastique de philosophie*, Louvain, since 1894.

Revue de l'Orient chrétien, Paris 1896 and sq.

Revue des Questions historiques, Paris, from 1866.

Revue des Sciences religieuses, Faculty of Cath. theol. of Strasbourg, Ulin 1921.

The following periodicals, are of MORE general interest than the foregoing, but also publish useful reviews and notices on Patrology, and contain many very good original studies.

Ami du Clergé, Langres, since 1878.

Études, French Jesuits, Paris, since 1856.

Ephemerides theologicæ lovanienses, Louvain, since 1924.

Revue Apologétique (Since 1905; *Revue pratique d'Ap.* until 1921), Paris.

Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique, Jesuits, Toulouse, since 1920.

Revue Augustinienne, Assumptionists, Louvain, 1902-1910.

Revue du clergé français, Paris, 1894-1920.

Revue thomiste, Dominicans, Toulouse, since 1893.

Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques, Dominicans, Le Plessis-Bois, since 1907.

I. *Université catholique*, Catholic Faculties of Lyons, since 1889.

La vie spirituelle, Dominicans, Saint-Maximin, since 1919.

III. RECENT BOOKS OF REFERENCE AND ENCHIRIDIA.

Ulysse Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen-Âge, Biographie*, 1st. ed. 1 vol., 2370 cols., 1877-1883, supplement in 1888. 2nd ed. newly augmented, in 2 vols., 1905-1907; contains, for all the men known since the founding of the Church until 1500, an article relating, in alphabetical order, everything that has been written on the subject. Such nomenclatures are very valuable but are never quite up to date.

Hugo Hurter, S. J. *Nomenclator literarius Theologia catholica*, Innsbruck, contains a biographical and literary notice, together with bibliographical allusions on all the authors who have treated of sacred subjects (philosophy, dogmatics, dogmatic and moral theology, patrology and Church history). The

/•atheis are found in the last volume of the 1st ed. (arranged as follows: ✠riter from 1564 to modern times, t. I, II, h i; writers of the Middle Ages 1109-1563, t. IV; writings from the beginning to 1109, t. v); from the 3rd edition, the order is more regular: Fathers, I, 1903; Middle Ages, It, 1906 etc.

H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, Freiburg, 1st ed. in 1854; new ed. 10th, greatly augmented and modified, in 1908, by C. Bannwart .S. J.; the later editions are completed b) appendixes and give in Latin, and where necessary in Greek, the texts indicated in the title, in historical order, together with a simple indication of the sources.

E. Cavaliere, *Thesaurus doctrina catholica ex documentis magisterii ecclesiastici*, Paris, 1920; gives the texts contained in Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, completed by the addition of other important but less solemn texts. This whole is arranged in the order found in theological treatises.

C. Kirch, S. J., *Enchiridion fontium historia ecclesiastica antiqua*, Freiburg, 1910: choice of important historical texts, in Ixitin and Greek, from the 1st to the 8th cent.

M. J. Rouët de Joumel, *Enchiridion palrislicum*, Freiburg, 1911, 5th ed in 1922; collection of texts from the Latin and Greek Fathers, especially a regards theology from the 1st to the 8th cent.

E. Amann, *Le dogme catholique dans les Pires de l'Eglise*, Paris, 1922 little anthology of Patristic texts, in French, preceded by a short account of the authors mentioned, without bibliography.

IV.—RECENT BIOGRAPHICAL AND LITERARY WORKS ON PATROLOGY.

See the *Introduction* (15-16) for studies of this nature previous to the 19th century.

I. General Patrologies.

J. Fessler, *Institutiones Patrologia*, 2 vols Innsbruck, 1850-1851: re-edited with many additions and corrections by B. Jungmann, 1890-1896, 2 vols.

B. Alzog, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1866.

J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik*, Mainz, 1882-1885, 3 vols
J. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1 vol. 1894; 3rd ed. 1910. A new French edition, considerably revised and augmented is edited by P. Godet and C. Verschaefel. entitled, *Les Pères de l'Eglise, leur vie et leurs œuvres*, 3 vols, Paris, 1905. In the following pages the references are to this edition (Abbrev. : Pat., I, or II or in).

Also by Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg four volumes already published, I (1st and 2nd cent), 1902; II (3rd cent.), 1903 III (4th cent.), 1912; IV (5th cent.), 1924.

P. Rauschen, *Grundriss der Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1903; French trans. *Eléments de Patrologie et d'Histoire des Dogmes*, by R. Ricard, Paris 1906 (2nd ed. 1911).

H. Kihn, *Patrologie*, 2 vols, Paderborn, 1904-1908.

J. Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, Paris, 1918; several new editions.

H. Jordan, (Protestant), *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig, 1918

2. Partial or incomplete patrologies.

P. Batiffol, *La littérature grecque*, (coll. B. E. H. E.) Paris, 1897; re-edited

R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque*, (coll. B. E. H. E.), Paris, 1899.

P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, Paris, 1901-1923 seven vols.

— *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris, 1924, 176 pages.

P. de Labriolle, *Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris, 1920, 1 vol., 740 pages.

- J. A. Mohler, *Patrologie, oder christliche literdr Geschichte*, Regensburg, 1812 (posthumous), one vol. on the first three centuries only; unfinished.
- i Kruinbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*, Munich, 1890; ..., 1 cil. augmented in 1897, in which theological literature is treated by V l j i k i a r d (p. 37-218).
- I bert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur aes Mittelallers in Abendlande*, I - M j g, 1874-1887, 3 vols., the first of which deals with the early writers until the 11th cent.
- Γ A Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius*, Leipzig, 1893, 1904, 3 large vols, the last two dealing especially with chronology.
- « Kruger, *Geschichte der altch. Literatur in den ersten drei lahrhund.* I o iburg, 1895 and 1897.
- I rin se last three authors are Rationalists or Protestants.

V.—WORKS DEALING WITH THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

I A) Recent works on the History of Dogma. (For the early writers, see the *Introduction*, Studies on the Fathers, p. 17-19.

i Catholic authors.

- J. H. Newtnan, *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, London. I i ; 2nd ed. 1878.
- H. Klee, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* Erlangen, 1837;
- J. N. Zob., *Dogmengeschichte* Innsbruck, 1865.
- J. A. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte*, Munster, t. I and II, 1862-1869; Freiburg, I, in ank iv, 1882, 1890; deals with each theological matter in four different I n nodes; ante-Nicene, Patristic, Middle Ages, Modern period.
- I Bach, *Dogmengeschichte des katolischen Mittelalters*, 1873-1875.
- A. Ginoulhiac, *Histoire du dogme catholique* during the first three centuries, I rms, 1852; unfinished; deals chiefly with God and the Trinity.
- J. Tixeront, *Histoire des dogmes* (coll. B. E. H. E.), Paris, 3 vols; I. Ante-Kiirne theology, 1905; II. From St. Athanasius to St. Augustine, 1909; III The end of the Patristic age (430-800); many revised editions for the 1st to Hi: 7 ch tomes; the order is chiefly historical. (Abbrev. : Hist. Dogm.).

o Protestant or Rationalist authors.

- A. Harnack. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Freiburg, 1885-1890, 3 vols, i. undriss der D.] 1893. The author admits a series of essential transformations of Christian doctrine under the influence of Greek thought.
- R. Seeberg, German conservative Protestant, has like Harnack, published / I rms (1895) and a *Manual* (1900) of the History of Dogma.
- the following also may be mentioned. Fr. Bonifas, *Histoire des dogmes* i. l'Eglise chrétienne, Paris, 1889; Bethune-Baker, author of an *Introduction* i. the history of Christian doctrine until the year 451, London, 1903; Balanos, Εισαγωγή ει την ιστοριαν των δογμάτων, Athens, 1919.

B) General studies on special points.

Many monographs have been written on these questions since the middle of the 19th century. The majority are concerned with the work of some early μ or treat of some controversy; they will be indicated in the appropriate »I η»iers of this work. Others deal with one doctrinal point and follow its »I k l o p m e n t throughout the whole Patristic period, or some important part of its l i n » d i o n : only these latter are mentioned below.

A. d'Alès, *l'Edit de Calliste, Etude sur les origines de la pénitence chrétienne*. (toll. B. T. H.), Paris. 1914. — / c dogme de Nicée, Paris, 1926.

- R. Aigrain, *Pour qu'on lise les Pères*, Paris, 1922.
- G. Bardy, *En lisant les Pères*, Paris, 1921.
- P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive*, first series (on the discipline of the secret, penance, the hierarchy, the agape), Paris, 1902; second series (on the Eucharist) recast since the 5th ed. (the 8th ed. 1920 is cited in the following pages).
- *Le catholicisme des origines à S. Léon*, a series of studies comprising four works :
1. The primitive Church (l'Eglise naissante) and Catholicism. 1909.
 2. The Peace of Constantine and Catholicism, 1914.
 3. The Catholicism of S. Augustine, 2 vol. 1920.
 4. The Apostolic See (359-451), 1924.
- E. Bouvy, *Les Pères de l'Eglise*, in the *Rev. Augustinienne*, t. V, VI, Vita (1904-1905).
- F. Cabrol, *Le livre de la prière antique*, Paris, 1900.
- L. Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (coll. B. T. II.), Paris 1912.
- L. Duchesne, *Autonomies ecclésiastiques, Eglises séparées*, Paris. 1905 (2nd. ed.) — *Les origines du culte, chrétien*, Paris, 2nd ed. 1898.
- *L'Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 3 vol., is on the Index. A 4th volume was published in 1926.
- P. Galtier, *De penitentia (Tractatus dogmatico-historicus)*, Paris, 1923.
- *De incarnatione ac Redemptione*, Paris, 1926.
- Mgr M. d'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesia*, Paris, 1920, 1921.
- M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium*, Paris, 4 vols 1926 and sq.
- J. Lebreton, *Les origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910. — The same author has recently published in various periodicals (*Rech. Sc. Rel.; Rev. hist. Eccles.; Gregorianum*), a series of articles on the dogma of the Trinity according to the authors of the first centuries; important elements of the history of the dogma previous to the Council of Nicaea are to be found in these articles.
- M. Lepin, *L'idée du sacrifice de la messe*, Paris, 1926.
- F. Martinez, *L'ascétisme chrét. pendant les trois premiers s. de l'Eglise* (coll. E. T. II.), Paris, 1913.
- A. Michiels, *L'origine de l'épiscopat*. Study on the foundation of the Church] the work of the Apostles and the development of the episcopate during the first two centuries. Louvain, 1900.
- F. Mourret, *Hist. gén. de l'Eglise: I. Origines chrétiennes. II. Les Pères de l'Eglise*, etc. Paris, 1919.
- Neubert, *Marie dans l'Eglise anabaptiste*, Paris, 1908.
- J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine*, (coll. B. E. II. E.), Paris, 1905.
- P. Pourrai, *La théologie sacramentaire*, Paris. 1907.
- *La spiritualité chrétienne, I, Des origines au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1918.
- Rauschen, *Eucharistie und Bußsacrament*, Fren, trans. by Decker and Ricard, Paris, 1919.
- Th. de Régnon, *Etudes de théologie positive sur la sainte Trinité*, Paris 1892-1896, 4 vols (work unfinished).
- J. Rivière, *Le Dogme de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1905.
- L. Saltet, *Les réordinations*, Paris, 1907.
- A. Sandreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu et les moyens d'y arriver, d'après les Grands Maîtres de la Spiritualité*, 3rd ed. revised and augmented, Angers, 1921.
- P. Semeria, *Dogma, gerarchia e culto nella Chiesa primitiva*, Rome, 1902.
- M. de la Taille, *Mysterium fidei*, Paris, 1921.
- J. Tixeront, *Le sacrement de pénitence dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, (coll. Sc. Rel.), Paris, 1914.
- *Mélanges de Patrologie et d'Histoire des Dogmes* (Eleven different studies), Paris, 1921.
- *L'Ordre et les Ordinations*, Paris, 1924.

- I. Vacandard, *Etudes de critique et d'Histoire religieuse* 3 series, Paris, 1910, 1912.
 II. É. Card. Van Rossum, *De essentia sacramenti Ordinis disquisitio*
 dogmatica Freiburg B. 1914.

A. Villien, *Histoire des commandements de l'Eglise*, Paris, 1909.

A fair number of similar monographs may be found in the above mentioned works, and still more in the great *Encyclopedias*. The *Dictionnaire de théol. cath.* is rich in this respect. It contains, for instance, an exposition of the teaching on *God (Dieu)* by X. Le Bachelet, on *Jesus Christ* and the *Christian Union*, by A. Michel, on *Justification* by J. Riviere, on the *Gifts of the Holy Spirit*, by A. Gardeil, on the *Immaculate Conception* by X. Le Bachelet and J. Bigie, the *Eucharistic Eucharist*, by S. Salaville, on the *Eucharist* by F. Lueille, on the *Origins of the Episcopate* by F. Prat, etc., etc. For the questions the *Dictionnaire Apologétique* is no less valuable; for instance the articles on *Mary in early patristic tradition*, the *Papacy (origins of)*, *Trinitarianism, Redemption, Penance*; P. Galtier's article on *Confession (penance)*. F. Michiels on *Bishops*, E. Vacandard on the *Apostles' Creed*, L. Duchesne on *Gnosis*, etc.

INTRODUCTION.

I. GENERAL NOTION OF PATROLOGY.

Patrology is that branch of Theology which deals with the life, writings and doctrine of the orthodox writers of Christian Antiquity.

By Christian Antiquity we mean the first eight centuries of the Church. Although the historians are far from being agreed on this delimitation, we have resolutely decided to keep under this title, as forming the *1st Epoch of the History of the Church*, not only the centuries of persecution, but that of Constantine and Theodosius and even what is usually termed the *Early Middle Ages* until shortly after the death of Charlemagne. In our opinion, the Middle Ages properly so-called, really begin with the breaking up of the Carolingian Empire, the growth of *feudalism* and the gradual formation of the great rival peoples of the West under the spiritual sway of the Papacy. Similarly, from the religious standpoint, the Middle Ages may be said to coincide with the *separation of the Byzantine Church from the West*, a Church which, abetted by the Emperor, expanded greatly that it brought under its authority almost the whole of the East, and particularly the Slavonic peoples, whose conversion has been retarded right up to our own day.

The Modern Period which forms the *IIIrd Epoch* begins with it the consummation of this lamentable rending

This conception of the Middle Ages will, no doubt, astound those who ally the word with the idea of "*barbarism*" and hold that the only true civilisation is the Graeco-Roman and that of the modern world since the Renaissance, for whom the space of time between corresponds to the absence of civilisation. The fact is that modern civilisation is derived from that of the ancient world, thanks to the *action of the Church* which transmitted it to the new world. (See G. Kurth: *Qu'est-ce que le Moyen-Age?* Paris, Collection *Le Livre et Religion*). The Middle Ages are the *middle epoch* of the history of the Church and of civilisation. Various authors have considered it as beginning earlier or later, according to the nature of the phenomena upon which they have insisted. The events of which we have written had a universal influence and affected both the Church and the political and social order of the world.

of Christendom, completed by another yet more serious, that of *Protestantism*.

Christian Antiquity, as we have defined it, possesses a characteristic which is absent in the later periods. Christendom, composed at that time of two great parts, the *Latin* world and the *Greek* world, was really *one*, in spite of the partial and sometimes lengthy divisions which harrowed it at various times. It is a consequence of this unity that the writers of this period, unlike the majority of their successors, are still held in veneration throughout almost the whole of Christendom. They are cited readily not only by Catholics but also by the various Protestant sects and the Eastern Orthodox. It is for this reason that they can be classed apart¹.

These authors are called Fathers. At first this title was peculiar to the heads of Churches, to the bishops who were the guardians both of disciplinary and doctrinal authority! Later, however, theological treatises and the studies of the Councils of the fifth century referred especially to the latter authority. It was then that this word came to mark out the defenders of the Faith against the heretics, even though, as it sometimes happened, these authors did not possess the episcopal character².

It is evident, then, that the title of Father connotes orthodoxy³. Patrology is not concerned with every Christian author who has written on religious subjects but only with those who, having observed St. Paul's injunction *depositum custodi* (I Tim. VI, 6), can be quoted by Christians of a later age with certain authority⁴. The heretics are not worthy of this honourable title. If they are dealt with in

¹ Concerning the Patristic period and the Fathers of the Church in general, see P. E. Bouvy: *Les Pères de l'Eglise* in the *Revue Augustinienne*, vol. v. (1904) p. 461-485.

² Bardenhewer: *Les Pères de l'Eglise*, I, p. 1-3; Tixeront: *Hist. eccl. Dogmes*, vol. III, p. 7-8 (for the East) and p. 327-329 (for the West).

³ "To live in the Catholic faith and communion, in holiness, wisdom and steadfastness, to teach in conformity with that faith and in that communion, to persevere to the end, worthy to die in Christ or joyously to be put to death for His sake"; he who accomplishes such an ideal may truly be placed among the *magistri probabiles*, among the recognised Fathers of the Church whose witness is a deciding factor in controversy. P. E. Bouvy (*Rev. Aug.*, vol. v. p. 470) thus summarises the teaching of St. Vincent de Lerins (*Commonitorium*, 28, 29).

⁴ We leave to more specialised works the task of examining the conditions which are necessary in order that the doctrine, based on the Fathers' teaching, should have a real dogmatic and theological value.

In the following pages, it is only inasmuch as an acquaintance with their writings is necessary if one would appreciate how roughly those authors who have remained strong in the Faith have refuted them. Both the writings and the labours of those authors who alone have been approved by the Church, or who at least have never been disapproved by it, render them truly deserving of being the guides, teachers and "Fathers" of all Christians.

In order, therefore, that an author may be regarded as a father of the Church, he must have *lived during the first of the Church*, fulfilled the required conditions of *orthodoxy and holiness of life* and merited the *approval of the Church*. This title, nevertheless, has been conferred on certain early writers who fulfilled only partially the last three of these conditions. Tertullian, Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea may be cited as an instance of this. In any case the valuable services that these men have rendered to the Church explain these exceptions.

The title of Father is not altogether identical with that of Doctor of the Church. The latter designation is applied only to a very few ecclesiastical writers who lived not only during the first centuries (these are both Fathers and Doctors) but also at later periods. Since this title supposes a special approbation of the Church, it is given only to those authors who unite in themselves a *profound knowledge of Christian truth, a rigid orthodoxy and exemplary holiness of life*. Some few among these possess exceptional authority. The Byzantine Church has a great respect for Saint Basil, Saint Gregory Nazianzenus and Saint John Chrysostomus, whom she calls the Oecumenical Doctors. Rome adds the name of Saint Athanasius to the foregoing and awards the same place in the West to Saint Ambrose, Saint Jerome, Saint Augustine and Saint Gregory the Great. These are the *eight great Doctors of the Church*.

Although the expression of thought on religious subjects did not cease to be active and fruitful with the passing of Christian Antiquity, it tended to take on newer, and on the whole, more methodical forms than previously. The theologians as well as the spiritual leaders acquired an overwhelming influence and many of the more brilliant

¹ Hardbnhewer, *loc. cit.*, p. 3-6; Fessler-Jungmann, *Instit. Pat.*, I. 27-41; ni Vaiton, article *Docteur de l'Eglise* in the *Diet. Th. Catti*, (col. 15091510).

among them have earned the title of Doctor of the Church. There was indeed a time when they appeared in such numbers, when their doctrines met with so much consideration, when their works were so sound, that it is no exaggeration to term the centuries during which they flourished, the golden age of the *Theologians and the Doctors*.¹ This period reaches from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. It should not be thought, however, that these great thinkers represent an isolated movement within the Church. They do but carry on the great intellectual tradition of previous centuries; they are the direct descendants of the Fathers. It is not unwarranted, therefore, to include them in a treatise of Patrology and we are not the first to do so. This method is justified in practice by its immense utility in demonstrating the uninterrupted doctrinal life of the Church, and further by drawing the reader's attention to the works of these doctors who, in our own time, are undoubtedly the masters of Christian thought; both as regards Spirituality and Theology.

II. THE OBJECT OF PATROLOGY.

The object of Patrology is the *history* and the *doctrine* of the Fathers of the Church : that is the title of this work. |

The study of the Lives of the authors, and especially of those who occupy the foremost ranks in the doctrinal battles of the Church, is particularly important and useful, for it is thus that we can arrive at the true character of these men and a sure understanding of the circumstances which occasioned the composition of their works.

Their Writings are a part of history. The first care, then, must be to determine which of them are *authentic*. The scope of this book, however, renders it impossible to elucidate! all the critical problems which arise. We will content ourselves usually with giving the findings of the more recent authors who have treated these questions. On the other hand, we intend to give a considerable *analysis* of the chief works of the leading authors in each period. This method]

¹ The most outstanding collection of patristic writings, that of Migne, goes as far as the thirteenth century in the Latin part and as far as the fifteenth for the Greek part. Both parts bear the name "Patrology".

Will enable us to lead up to a synthetic summing up of the whole of their teaching ».

The Doctrine of these authors is likewise the object of Patrology. It is obviously impossible to cover the whole field, but we can at least draw attention to the following: 1) The various points on which each Father has particularly insisted; those which mark a distinct step forward on those of his predecessors or those which prove him to be a pioneer. 2) His opinions regarding the most controverted questions of his day and environment, or the information he supplies in regard to otherwise obscure periods. 3) Lastly, the weaker points of his teaching, requiring a favourable interpretation or even unequivocal condemnation.

It is by means of this doctrinal synthesis that Patrology is often linked up with the *History of Dogma* and *Positive Theology* 2.

The word *dogma*, in the present sense of the term, does not mean the whole of Christian doctrine but only revealed truths as proposed by the Church 3. These truths have not always been grasped with equal understanding. The formulas which contain them, before their definition and even in the actual fixing of the definition, were the subject of remarkable controversies, which provide the matter of the *History of Dogma*. The latter is completed by the *History of Theology*, which deals with the inception and the development of the various systems which have been thought out in order to explain these same truths. Since the Fathers have played an important part in these controversies and (even though they invented personal theological systems, any in mind of their teaching must be accompanied by frequent incursions into these two branches of the *History of the Church*.

In addition Positive Theology, which concerns itself with showing by means of Holy Scripture and Tradition that such a truth is really revealed by God and defined by the Church, supposes on the one hand a thorough acquaintance with the Fathers, and on the other contributes to the

It thus giving greater space to doctrinal treatment and reducing the critical part, hardly needful in an elementary course, we count on escaping the criticisms of various authors of Patrology, such as Nirschl, Rausches and even Bardenhever (See *Patrologie*, p. 4, note 1).
 * Fixeront, *Histoire des Dogmes*, vol. I, p. 1-5.

1 *ii.*, Sen. III., Const. *Defide*, cap. 3. (Denzinger 1792).

understanding of their writings. *Patrology* must not be confused with that other branch of Positive Theology, *Patristic* or *Historical Theology*, but it paves the way and leads to it, occasionally calling in its aid.

Besides dogma in its true sense, The Doctrine of the Fathers comprises certain other aspects worthy of notice if one wishes to appreciate the fulness of their thinking,] particularly that of the greatest among them. We mean their *inorai*, *ascetical* and *mystical* teaching. The earlier Fathers do not make a clear distinction between moral and ascetical theology, seeming to consider that the determination of good and evil (general object of *moral theology*)\ was inseparable from the effort and progress which are] necessary for the avoidance of the one, and the perfect! accomplishment of the other (the object of *ascetical theology*)! Mystical Theology differs from both the foregoing. In the writings of the Fathers, however, it has many points in common with them; we must therefore occasionally refer to it and point out its influence. To leave it aside entirely! would be to disregard a most interesting quality of their teaching which accounts for the supernatural atmosphere) which pervades it from beginning to end. But while the *principles* of dogmatic or moral theology are well known to our readers, they may not be so familiar with those of mystical theology. It is of the highest importance that! we should come to an understanding on the principles which we will use to criticise the works in question. A few pages will be given to a summary of these principles (*see the end of this introduction*) where the terminology we intend to employ will be explained L

III. GENERAL METHOD AND DIVISION.

A) Our intention in writing this summary has been to construct a *synthesis*. The only means of achieving this, purpose is to insist particularly on the Great Writers who formed a kind of centre of gravity in each century. And in order that their teaching and activities may be better appreJ

' This exact explanation is absolutely indispensable in dealing with the authors of the Middle Ages and the Modern Period, and will be found extremely useful for a better understanding of the earlier ones, particularly of the Alexarri drian and Augustinian schools.

reference will be made to the general data of the history of dogma regarding their epoch. By these means it will be possible to conserve the necessary unity of development in spite of the multiplicity of subject matter and in diversity of view-points. The humbler authors will be noticed upon in passing; they may be likened to satellites of the first dimension, in whose light they bathe and in whose vastness they accentuate.

B) General division of Patrology.

From the point of view of language, Patrology deals with texts written in *Latin, Greek, Syriac, Armenian* and *Copt*. The texts which have been published in the last three centuries, particularly at the present day, are numerous and occasionally important; the better known writers will be mentioned in their place. The majority of the authors of *Christian Antiquity*, including the most famous, used the *Latin* and the *Greek* tongue. These authors will be our chief concern.

Nevertheless the division of this work is not based primarily on geographical or linguistic considerations, but principally on *Doctrine and History*. Since the *ideas* of our authors are to be the first object of our research it is clear that their *intellectual kinship* is more important than their linguistic relationship. Those, therefore, who have treated the same subjects will, as far as possible, be dealt with together in order to achieve a better understanding of them all. This procedure, however, must be regulated by *chronological considerations*, for it can be dangerous to date an author from his own age. The literary productions of every period, no matter the subjects with which they deal, usually always echo the character and tendencies of their time. The order of the chapters in the following books will not appear to be illogical if it is clearly understood that the various periods have been subdivided into parts, and the parts themselves into chapters in accordance with the above principles.

Since Patrology is concerned with the whole of the orthodox literature of *Christian Antiquity*, it must reach to the beginning of the ninth century. It will therefore include authors which in our opinion are usually omitted without sufficient reason. We think that *Saint Theodore of Studium* deserves the title of Father quite as much as the most

illustrious of his immediate predecessors. Indeed, on the eve of the schism of Photius, it is he who is the most explicit Eastern witness to the traditional belief in the Roman privilege, current even at Byzantium. It would be unfair to leave this teaching, a complement to that of Saint John Damascenus, in the shade. The eight centuries then, which to our mind compose the Patristic Epoch of the history of the Church, are divided into three periods of unequal length, but of equal importance if they are considered from different standpoints :

1. The Origins of Patristic literature: 1st, 2nd, 3rd. centuries.]
2. The Great Century of the Fathers : from the year 300 to 430.
3. The Last Centuries of Patristic literature : from the, year 430 to 850.

A special *Book* will be devoted to each of these periods.:¹ Our survey of Patrology properly so called will therefore consist of three books. To these three will be added *a fourth* dealing with what we would term the *epoch of the great theologians*, stretching from the twelfth to the sixteenth century*. But as this is not properly a part of Patrology] a special Introduction is reserved for all that has particular reference to it.

C) Subdivisions of Patrology properly so-called.

I. The Period of Origins (Book 1) is now-a-days the subject of the greatest criticism. Books without number have been published recently on the authors of the first three centuries. Living closer to the very founders of the Church, these authors are pre-eminent *witnesses* to the traditional belief in the Trinity, for instance, or the Divinity of Christ. In addition, they teach us how the divine constitution which Jesus Christ gave to His Church was understood and carried into practice, and the manner in which its disciplinary organisation was formed. It is for these reasons that the *Apostolic Fathers* (1st Part) possess an outstanding authority, which they share, on many points, with the *last authors of*

¹ As this survey does not purport to be a complete history of Theology the, 9th, 10th and nth centuries may be neglected since they are a transitional period of which we will speak but slightly in passing. Only an appendix will be devoted to the period which follows Saint Francis of Sales. Our work comes to an end with this Doctor.

p. *second century* (IInd Part). Although the authors of the *third century* (Hird Part) sound but an echo of the far-away Hellenistic age, this is compensated by the attempts at doctrinal Hellenicisation that are found in their works, and which make them the true fore-runners of the great Doctors of the fifth century.

I The first Period (Book II) is the shortest of the Hellenistic age (from about 300 to 430 A. D.), extending from Saint Athanasius to the death of Saint Augustine. This is made up for by the fact that it was during this period that appeared the most powerful minds that ever graced the Church: it is also the time of the great doctrinal controversies on the Trinity and Grace. In Bossuet's time it was especially this period which attracted the attention of the Hellenicologians. In our time, more attention is paid to the beginnings: nevertheless the fruits which Theology and the Commandment of Christian knowledge reaped in the important literary productions of this period must not be forgotten, for this period is subdivided into two parts: the 1st Part from 300 to 360; *the Trinitarian problem* comes to the front, trickling with difficulties: the 2nd Part from 360 to 430; (the Trinitarian problem is solved by the great Doctors in a way that later centuries could but record and uphold it zealously. It was also at this time that the question of heresy was discussed.

I The last three centuries (430-850) composing the Hird Period (Book III) are sometimes called the decadent centuries. But this appellation casts an unmerited reflection on the authors of this period, who, being great, seem to have their greatness enhanced by their reaction against what was in many ways an unfavourable environment. This period will be divided into two parts. The 1st Part, that of the period of *Christological controversies*, extends from the Council of Ephesus (431) to the second Council of Constantinople (553). These controversies are rightly called *great*. They were born with Apollinarius and grew up with Monothelism, but it was during the century with which we are occupied, during the rise and fall of Semi-Pelagianism in the West, that the Councils and Doctors reached a definite solution. Moreover, the authors of this age formed a link between the failing ancient world and the new world which, as yet, had hardly begun its schooling: they passed the torch to the men who were to enlighten the barbarians; Saint Gregory the

Great in Italy, Saint Gregory of Tours in Gaul, Saint Isidore in Spain, the Venerable Bede in England (the Germanic peoples were converted only at the end of this period). These are the great men, too few, alas! who provide the matter of the IInd Part, together with the last and more numerous Eastern writers, who, at a time when the Iconoclasts and the Schismatics were daily gaining ground, rendered yeoman service to the Church in their struggles with Monothelism. The work that these men accomplished was considerable and should not be forgotten; and if their literary style appears inferior to that of the productions of the great century, this may easily be forgiven them, for these same writings have served so well the cause of truth.

IV. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY OF THE FATHERS

From many points of view an acquaintance with the Fathers is valuable to priests. Suffice it to mention the following:

1). Their Theological Culture can hardly be said to be complete if it lacks the elements of the *history of dogma* and *positive theology*. Even the most speculative among the theologians have been careful not to neglect the study on the Fathers. The manner in which the whole work of Saint Thomas is studded with patristic quotations proves him to have had a close acquaintance with ancient Christian literature. Theology, in fact, is no more than a rational explanation of the revealed data contained in Holy Scripture; it is based on exegesis and it was in the form of scriptural commentaries that it developed for many hundreds of years, particularly during the patristic period. It follows that a close acquaintance with the exegetical works of the Fathers is not only indispensable to a good theologian, but also enters into the education of the exegetist.

2). The study of the Fathers is especially needful to priests who are called to work in Protestant and Orthodox countries, where a sound knowledge of Apologetics is of immense value. A very great number of Protestants and Schismatics still hold the ancient authors in great esteem, and are more ready to adopt and understand truths on the authority of the Fathers than from any other source. The lives of Newman and Soloviev are examples of this.)

the one in England and the other in Russia, and their conversion to the Fathers, as well as a great deal of the intellectual influence which they enjoyed.

From the intellectual standpoint, again, Patrology, containing as it does the history of doctrines, provides a very much desired *Synthesis* which the division of ecclesiastical doctrines into apparently independent and parallel branches is apt to conceal. The link which really connects them and gives them unity is brought out clearly and distinctly in the writings of the Fathers. Where doctrine is concerned it is obvious that Patrology can have but a favourable influence (in a priest's education).

4). Patrology is also of great value in training Preachers. Bossuet was careful to point this out when he composed his *Discourse Concerning the style and the reading of the Fathers of the Church in the training of an orator* for the young Cardinal de Bouillon. Bossuet himself was a living testimony to the worth of the method he recommended. He never preached a sermon without having carefully perused the Bible and the Fathers. He used to fill numberless notebooks, chiefly with extracts on moral subjects, to which he referred when making the fair copy of his sermon, or which he meditated beforehand when he preached without notes. It may safely be averred that all great preachers have adopted this method, and it is they who have always provided us with the best types of that *spiritual exegesis* (page 28) which is so suited to preaching.

Bossuet, in his *Defence of Tradition and the Holy Fathers* 2, has also stressed another advantage of patristic writings which is lacking in the works of later authors. It consists in the Abundance of Christian feeling which they inspire and which pervades them all. "They produce", he says, "infinite fruit in those who study them; for, after all, these great men have fed on the bread of the elect, the very essence of religion; and being filled with that original spirit which they acquired so abundantly from its own living source, it often happens that the sentiments which they let fall naturally from their plenitude contain more nourishment than the things that have been meditated since.

¹ Lebarq, *Histoire critique de la prédication de Bossuet* Paris, 1891, see pp. 43, 303-306.

² *Defence de la Tradition et des saints Peres.* 1st Part, book IV, ch. 18.

My critics do not realise this", It is well known that Bossuet was thinking of *Richard Simon*. Bossuet charges him with reading the Fathers "unappreciatively and without feeling for great things", and with insisting only upon the weaker and more trivial parts of their writings, thus laying himself open to the scorn of readers "penetrated by the sense of fundamentals and the stamp of truth" which the teaching of these early Doctors convey.

6). To sum up, apart from the preceding reasons, the Fathers deserve to be studied for their own sake. Indeed, together with a great multiplicity of individual talent, the perfect type of Churchman is reproduced in each of these great men. Some are men of deeds, others of doctrine; apologists and philosophers; theologians and mystics. Nearly all are preachers, and some among them, Saint Augustine for instance, combine all these talents in one powerful personality. The majority, moreover, are saints. The historian may find in Patrology a unique portrait gallery of holiness and great souls. A far greater benefit will be derived from the study of the Fathers than from that of the heretics, although history must deal with these latter in order to lay bare their errors.

V. THE TEXT OF THE FATHERS. EARLY COLLECTIONS'.

The Patristic texts can be found in special editions, containing either a single work or the complete works of each author. These editions began in the sixteenth century,, but it was not until the seventeenth and the eighteenth

' Although it is our purpose to give only the properly so-called *patristic texts*., we think it desirable to mention the three following works of capital importance; which have a close relation to patristic study :

a) The *Acta Sanctorum*, work of the Bollandists of Brussels, begun in 1643, contains the Lives of the Saints according to the calendar; about 70 vol. in-folio; not,yet complete.

b) *Sac. Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio*, by J. D. Mansi, Florence, 1749-1798, 31 vol. in-folio; continued at present by J. B. Martin and Mgr. L. Petit. (This is the greatest collection of the Councils; the present editors propose to correct and improve it. See IL Quent in, *J. D. Mansi et les grandes collections conciliaires*, Paris, 1900.)

c) *Conciliengeschichte*, C. J. von Hefele, 7 vol. 1855-1871; vol. vm-ix, by Herger OBTHBR, 1887-1890; French trans, by Delarc, *Hist. des conciles*, 11 vol. 1869-1876; New translation with notes by H. Leclercq, O. S. B., since 1907.

activity that the critics became more diligent in their efforts to discern the most trustworthy readings among the mass of variants in the manuscripts. The editions they produced are models of their kind. The Benedictines of St. Maur des Fossés are particularly worthy of mention in the records of this laborious scholarship. They have had imitators in all other religious Orders.

Various authors have had the excellent idea of publishing the works of several writers in a single Collection. The largest and most voluminous of these *early collections* is that of the Canon of Bayeux and Doctor of the Sorbonne, Marguerin de la Bigne (d. 1589). In his *Bibliotheca Sanctorum Patrum* he gathered together the works of more than 200 early or mediæval writers. This collection gradually increased in size, and at Cologne in 1616 it had become the *Magna Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* in 14 in-folio volumes, containing the works of one hundred new authors. Later it was still further augmented by the inclusion of about a hundred other works or essays, and re-edited at Lyons under the title of *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et antiq. scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* in 17 volumes (1677).

At the same time other scholars undertook the compilation of less extensive collections, which usually contained the writings overlooked by previous authors. The following are the most noteworthy: ¹

i. Combéfis, O. P., *Novum Auctarium (Græco-Latina Patrum Bibliotheca)*, Paris, 2 vol. in-fol., 1648;

Auctarium novissimum (Bibi. Græc. Pat.), 2 vol. 1672; et *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria* (8 vol., 1662, etc.).

Luc d'Achéry, *Spicilegium* (13 vol. 1655-1677); this collection is spoilt by the documents forged by J. Vignier (d. 1661) which had previously been held to be the most valuable part of the contents.

Cotelier, *Ecclesia Græca Monumenta*, 4 vol. 1677-1688.

4. Baluze, *Miscellanea*, 8 vol., 1678-1715.

5. Sinnond, S. J., *Opera omnia*, 5 vol., 1696.

6. Muratori, *Anecdota*, 4 vol., 1697-1713.

Anecdota Græca, i vol., 1709.

7. Grabe, *Spicilegium*, 2 vol., 1698-1699.

8. B. de Montfaucon, O. S. B., *Collectio Nova*, 2 vol., 1706.

Note.—Apart from the general collections, nearly all the Fathers, and particularly Saint Augustine, have been published separately by the Benedictines of St. Maur. Their work reveals an unequalled critical

¹ Hurter's *Nomenclator Litterarius* contains a note on the majority of these authors.

insight. The better known of these publications are *B. de Montfaucon*, *Marian*, *De la Rue*, *Blampin*, *Massuet*, etc. No less valuable are their articles and essays on the authors they have published.

9. The Oratorian, A. Galland (d. 1779), published a collection which he averred was fuller and more exact (*Longe locupletior et accuratior*) than the "Maxima Bibliotheca" of 1677: this is the *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum* (14 vol. Venice, 1765-1781, and 1788). It is true that the Greek text is given with its translation, and that de la Bigne's editions omitted it; often enough also the text has been amended and has an accompanying introduction or notes. The collection, however, does not go beyond the thirteenth century, whereas the other goes on to the sixteenth; furthermore, the 380 authors quoted are not the most important¹.

In the nineteenth century three scholars were especially outstanding for their publication of hitherto unedited patristic texts. They were :

M. J. Routh in *Reliquia sacra* (4 vol., 1814-1818, Oxford).

A. Mai, S. J., Cardinal, in many publications, chiefly in the *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, 7 vol., 1852-1854.

J. Pitra, O. S. B., also a Cardinal, in *Spicilegium Solesmense* (1852-58), *Analecta Sacra...* (1876-1884), etc.

There is no doubt that the principal and most valuable work which has ever been compiled for the purpose of putting the patristic texts at the disposition of theologians is that of the Abbé Migne (d. 1865)². His collection, *Patrologiæ cursus completus* has no equal and is immensely valuable, although in some cases it needs completing and amending by recent scholarships. It was not Migne's aim to publish the hitherto unpublished, nor to revise texts which had already been edited. His sole idea was to gather together the majority of known works, to which previously only the favoured ones had had access. Eminent scholars, such as Cardinal Pitra, helped him with many parts of his task. Migne's collection stretches well beyond the patristic period properly so called. The *Latin Patrology* extends as far as Pope Innocent III (d. 1216) and contains 217 volumes with 4 volumes of indexes (218-221). The *Greek Patrology*, with Greek text and Latin translation, goes³

¹ Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, ... v. 1, p. 47-51. See also Hurter, loc. cit., V. v, col. m.

² H. Hurter, *Nomenclator*, V., 1605-1607.

³ See above : *General Bibliography*.

as the Council of Florence (1438-1445) and contains in volumes; the last, the 162nd, was never printed as a fire destroyed all the founts while it was being printed. The Latin series was published from 1844 to 1855 and the Greek from 1857 to 1866. It is only recently that the critical index of the latter has been made.* A list of the collections which have appeared since Migne's will be found in the general Bibliography.

VI. STUDIES ON THE FATHERS.

A) Although the name, "Patrology", is a recent invention, 'Patristic Studies are found dating from the earliest times, Saint Jerome was the first to conceive the idea of treating all the Christian authors in a single work, as Suetonius had done two hundred years before him for secular literature. This plan is carried out in the *De viris illustribus* (393). Eusebius, however, had already devoted a good deal of space to writers in his *Ecclesiastical History*. Jerome's simple was followed by Gennadius of Marseilles in Gaul and by Saint ISIDORE in Spain, whose work was continued by Saint IDROPHONSUS. All these authors will be dealt with later. PHOTIUS (d. 891) may also be mentioned here. His *Myriobiblion* or *Bibliotheca* is rendered valuable both by his notes on early writers and his abstracts of their works (about 280).

The writers of the Middle-Ages, who were so fond of quoting the Fathers, right up to and even after the time of P. Lombard, drew largely on collections of doctrinal texts for their knowledge. The historical and literary aspect was apt to be neglected. The few works in this type which we still possess are extremely summary in treatment: the *De viris illustribus* by Siebert of Gembloux (d. 1123), *De luminaribus fidei* of Honorius of Autun (about 1125), *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* by an anonymous author (said to be from Melk, Austria) and the *De viris illustribus* by an unknown author of that period. On the other hand, we still have a vast treatise, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (1114) by Jean Trithème (d. 1516), but the greater number of the 963 writers whom he treats are posterior to the patristic period.

1. Cavallera, *Pat. cursus compl., series Grimi, Indices*, Paris, 1912. — I. is an edition of Migne's *Greek Patrology* in 81 volumes, in which there is no Greek text, but only a Latin translation of the patristic writings.

G., 103.

P. L., 160.

* P. L., VI2.

P. L., 213.

We will single out for mention only the following authors who dealt with patristic literature during the Renaissance and the following centuries :

1. BELL ARMINE (d. 1621) whose *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (1613) went into more than twenty editions, in spite of its imperfections

2. DOM LE NO URRY (d. 1724), author of the *Apparatus ad Bibliothecam Maximam... Lugduni editam* (2 vol., 1703-1713).

3. DOM Ce illier (d. 1761), author of *l'Histoire generate des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques* (23 vol., 1729-1763). In spite of its Jansenist tendencies, this book is finer intellectually than that of

4. ELLIES DuiTN (d. 1719), author of *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* in 47 volumes (1686-1714). This work was put on the Index on account of the author's rash and excessive leanings to Gallicanism 13

5. J. S. ASSÉMANI (d. 1768) made a useful contribution to the knowledge of early Syriac literature with his *Bibliotheca orientalis* (4 vol., 1719-1728, Rome) : he treats each author, summarises their works and even gives long quotations 3 ; he quotes all the Catalogue of early Syriac writers compiled by Bishop *Ebedjesus of Nisibis* in 1298.

The Fathers were cultivated by the Protestants also at this time. It was the Lutheran, J. GERHARD (d. 1637), who invented the name, *patrology*, and gave it to his book which was published posthumously in 1653. Among other Reformation scholars who wrote on Patristic literature the following may be noted : the Englishman, W. CAVE (1713), author of *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum historia litteraria*, 1688, London; and above all the German, FABRICIUS (1736), whose *Bibliotheca græca seu notitia scriptorum veterum græcorum* (14 vol., 1705-1738) embodies accounts of a number of ecclesiastical authors *

So far, only studies of a general nature have been in question. A fair number of *particular* surveys of authors and their works were composed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. These are usually due to the editors of collected works, and especially the great collections, Migne's for instance.

1 See I.E Bachelet, art. *Bellarmin* in the *Did. Thiol.*, col. 584.

2 See HURTER, *Nomenclator Utt.*

3 See *Did. Thiol.*, art. *Assimani (Jos. Sim.)*, col. 2121.

* See the *Did. Thiol.*, art. *Fabricius*.

The nineteenth century writers carried on the work of their predecessors, completing it all round and in many cases overlooking it. A list of the principal recent works will be found in the *General Bibliography*.

I. The doctrinal study of the Fathers has not suffered by the so meticulous critical and literary labours that have been accomplished since the Renaissance. It had always been an object of interest, before the Middle Ages and even during the Middle Ages, though often enough its treatment was sadly wanting in method. Since the seventeenth century, however, it has been given new life by scholarly tradition. *Positive Theology* was improved to such an extent by *Petau*, *Thomassin*, *Renaudot*, *Chardin* and *Morin*, that their achievements still command respect to-day. It attained a twofold purpose, for by solidly establishing the historical basis of our dogmas it strengthened the Catholics in their faith and proved to the Protestants that their accusation of *innovation*, which they addressed to the Catholic Church, was without foundation. At that time the reformed churches were at one with the Catholics in admitting that the doctrine of the Church should not differ from that of the early Church. In consequence, they made great efforts to show that their own particular theologies were in conformity with the teaching of the Fathers. Some theologians of the reformed churches still cling to this opinion; but the charms of the evolution of dogma have made great inroads into their ranks.

It was the German rationalists, however, who, having laid down the principle that new dogmas existed in the Church, undertook the compilation of *Histories of Dogma*. This is the very title that *Münscher* of Marburg (d. 1814) gave to two of his works. He had his imitators. C. Baur (d. 1860) and the Tübingen school brought this new learning into contact with the Protestants by applying the then fashionable (theory of evolution to dogma. They explained the formation of the Church and the development of doctrine by purely natural causes. This evolutionary theory attributed the development to human initiatives, swiftly followed by various innovations, ending finally with a compromise. The history of dogma is thus ruled by three principles: thesis, antithesis and

1. *Handbuch der christlichen dogmengeschichte*, 4 vols., 1797; *Lehrbuch der christlichen dogmengeschichte*, 1811.

synthesis'. But this explanation seemed feeble when the first enthusiasm had faded. RITSCHL (d. 1889) found a substitute for it in the influence of Greek Philosophy, which he averred was the starting point and the guide of all the internal modifications that doctrinal Christianity had gone through. A. HARNACK still held to this way of thinking in his two works on the *History of Dogma*, the *Lessons* (1886-90) and the *Summary* (1889-91). SCHLEIERMACHER'S disciples have had recourse to the influence of religious feeling in addition to the foregoing explanations. Among the French Protestants, A. SABATIER combined all these tendencies and even sowed the seeds of *modernism* in Catholic circles. Pius X forcefully condemned this error, which not only has no foundation in Tradition and the Fathers but rather is in open contradiction to their teaching.

The idea of a certain Development of Dogma is not opposed to the Catholic conception of its essential immutability. It was already treated in the fifth century by Vincent of Lerins. This point of view, however, was less apparent to early writers than was the unvarying unity of revealed doctrines. This distinction between a doctrine and the expression of that doctrine might have been of great value at the Reformation; but even an apologist like Bossuet does not seem to have given a thought to it when confronted with Protestant difficulties concerning the supposed new dogmas of Rome. It was not until the nineteenth century that the question received definite treatment at the hands of Catholics. It was the most eminent convert of the century, Cardinal Newman, who, at a turning point in his life, threw most light on the subject in his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845). He really adopts the traditional solution of Vincent of Lerins, giving it fresh life by a variety of expression and also, perhaps, a fresh point of view. According to the Commonitorium 3, restated by the Vatican

1 These expressions may be translated literally as follows: the *assertion* of a doctrine (thesis) gives rise to *opposition* (antithesis), resulting finally in a *combination* of the two parts (synthesis).

2 The expression, *development of dogma by assimilation, by additions* may be misleading; but according to MARIN-SOLA in his *Evolution homogène du dogme catholique*, Fribourg, 1924 (vol. I. p. 341-353), the Cardinal meant a homogeneous development in a "*fully traditional*" sense.

3 Comm. 28.—See below, Book HI.

.....cil ., and more recently by Pius X a, it is the *understand-*
knowledge and *wisdom* which grow in the Church, while
 Hh "b)ject of faith remains identically the same (*in suo*
'iiiitaxai genere).

I l lit Fathers are outstanding instances of men who pos-
 (< l this understanding of the truth, the requisite know-
 il . l to express it and wisdom to decide its worth. The
 " less of dogma became a real thing in they writings and
 H "tigh their influence. Modern Catholic authors } have not
 l employed the same method in treating this subject.
 mix (Schwane, Ginoulhiac), taking the great dogmatic
 t-dises as a foundation (Trinity, Grace, etc.), have given a
 in ccutive account of the ideas of all the great writers who
 in- treated these questions. Others, such as *Tixeront*, have
 Tlerred the historical order, and made a survey of the
 «iii of the doctrine regarding each of these questions during
 Irecssive periods. The latter method will be followed in
 i- following pages. The doctrinal notions, however, will be
 IMted simultaneously with the Fathers who have been the
 i" t explicit on each great question during their times.
 Iii . is the only way we can hope to carry out the elementary
 ll sufficient synthesis we have undertaken to achieve.

VII. ELEMENTARY NOTIONS OF MYSTICAL THEOLOGY⁴.

A. Mysticism in general.

I Notion Of Mystical Theology⁵. Mystical Theology can only
 i defined by distinguishing it from Ascetical Theology. Ascetical
 livology is no other than a branch and particular form of *Moral*
h..>h>gy. Both of them may be strictly called theological sciences.
 ni il Theology treats of human acts in the aim of directing them to
 ml considered as the last supernatural end of man. This is evidently
 h i subject, and it is not surprising that various special sciences have
 hi called in to the help of this general science in order to deal either

⁴ (Anstit. defide catholica, ch. IV. (Denzinger-Bannwart, num. 1800).

⁵ /ncycl. Pascendi (Denzinger-Bannwart, 2095).

"■ list of their names and works in the general bibliography.

• These principles are taken from Saint Augustine, Saint Thomas, Saint
 " . l and Saint John of the Cross. For a fuller treatment see our essay on Co.,-
 <n/i,oiio>i Augustinienne.

⁷ The word *mystical* is here understood in a strictly theological sense. We can
 ill make a vigorous protest against the misuse of this word to indicate a kind
 ' rue religious feeling or a purely natural and often morbid sentimentalism.
 ll dud is poles apart from true mysticism as we understand it.

with a single aspect of this subject or with the entire subject from a particular point of view. The latter is the purpose of *Ascetical Theology*. It is that part of Moral Theology which is concerned with the ordering of man's acts accordingly as he progresses in the practice of virtue, in order to lead him on to supernatural perfection and complete union with God. In a wide sense, Moral Theology is the study of human acts] regarded from a supernatural standpoint: in a stricter sense it consists in the study of all the general and particular conditions which are required for human acts to be supernaturally good. Ascetical Theology must be distinguished from the latter acceptation of Moral Theology, since it is the purpose of Ascetical Theology to give to these acts all the perfection possible according to the actual state of the soul of the believer. It takes him as he enters into the Christian life, or rather as he makes his first steps towards perfection (the first leanings of a well disposed soul towards the good) and shows him how he must *begin*, how he must *advance* and finally how he must *practise perfect* virtue. Those who are termed perfect possess a far more intense moral activity than ordinary Christians, for this activity increases in proportion to their responsiveness to grace. This activity, even of the saints themselves,] is guided by Moral and Ascetical Theology, although for them the principles of Mystical Theology must be taken into account.

Mystical Theology is that branch of Theology which deals with the *eminent graces which God accords to virtuous souls so that they may enter into the unitive or perfect way and be capable of accomplishing its acts*. It is a theological science, based on Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. It has a closer affinity to Dogmatic Theology! than to Moral, although there is no essential difference between these! two, and it is dependent on the treatises concerning grace and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Nevertheless, it pays particular attention to the teaching and the experience of the Fathers and the Saints, in order] to enlighten Ascetical Theology for the guidance of those souls who have been led to perfection through grace.

The mystical graces, to which we have referred, are really what is known as Contemplation. This is the true sense of that term! Without ornament and directly, it means the superior gifts of wisdom and understanding which so enlighten the soul in regard to God that] it is able to produce most perfect acts of charity'. The word, taken in this sense, by no means excludes its other significations but rather includes them, since they are all derived more or less directly from it. 1

Thus, in a derived sense, the following may be termed mystical:

a). The activity of the love of God which is called forth by this illumination (*infused love*).

b). The practice of all the *gifts of the Holy Ghost*, inasmuch as they prepare the way for the superior gifts of wisdom and understanding, or accompany that action.

c). *Asceticism* itself when it is less concerned with the direct eradication of sin than with aiding the perfect action of the gifts] especially the greater ones.

d). *The state of the soul* of those Christians who are favoured with these eminent graces.

1 See below (B) for the explanation of this definition.

Lastly, various *extraordinary phenomena* such as visions and hirs, or even what is rarer, certain preternatural effects which may in the mystical state.

We do not intend to occupy ourselves with these last points. After having given an account of the various degrees of the spiritual life fling to the great ascetics or writers on asceticism, we will give ue lengthy account of the mystical state in general.

The Degrees of Spiritual Life. We must go to Ascetical Vliology for information regarding the *stages* of the soul's progress Im .mis perfection. There are usually said to be three of these, which Hu known as ways: The Purgative Way, that of beginners or *souls* if/ iyod-wUl; The Illuminative Way, that of souls which are advancing, in *virtuous souls*; lastly, The Unitive Way, that of the *perfect*. riu ie descriptions are given by the ascetics and may be found in Nnint Thomas. These would have seemed sufficient had the mystics lint left such finely drawn descriptions of states of soul that the last two Wiyy. must be necessarily subdivided.

The Illuminative Way is characterised in the first place by the Innucious efforts which are necessary for the acquisition and consoli- (tion of virtue. Its final stage is usually the achievement of interior Brin e so that the soul may more easily respond to the action of powerful lililés. These graces are required by the soul so that it may make flu renuncements of self which are the prelude to entering on the Unitive way. Consequently, virtuous souls may be divided into :). *fervent souls*; 2. *souls at peace* (Saint Augustine J describes the lile of souls of "good-will" and "fervent" souls by the word *virtus* nml of souls at "peace" by the word *tranquillitas*).

furthermore, at least two degrees must be distinguished in the Unitive Way or *way of the perfect*. Perfect souls are those who linving wholeheartedly renounced self, maintain themselves ina habitual nllite of union with the Will of God: the mainspring of all their acts is n extremely pure and intense love. Their eyes are opened on God mid the truths of faith by lights from on high which are the guide of all tlirir actions. These lights may be observed existing in various degrees In all the perfect: 1. firstly, in what we will call *men offaith*, that ll to say men of simple faith, but which is at the same time *luminous*, h.ei'v and active; 2. secondly, and above all, in the saints, in whom lin e lights are so intense that they sometimes cause ecstasy in the true •ruse of the word. They are indeed so powerful that it may be said lliry maintain the soul in a state of constant union with God, undisturbed by even the greatest external labours that the saints accomplish for His Hlm y (Saint Augustine characterises the state of soul of those we have tinned "men of faith" by the *entrance, ingressio*, into the supernatural light of contemplation; and the state of the saints as the permanent *duelling* in that light, *mansio*)}.
i The graces called mystical are usually accorded to advanced *virtuous* «"ills to enable them to enter on the way of the perfect. But although tin souls at peace are often favoured in this way, it is the perfect, too

¹ *Summa Theol.*, II næ, q. 24, art. 9.

² *Ile. quant. anima*, Num. 73, 74, 79, P. L. 32, col. 1075 sq.

³ *Ibid.*, n. 75, 76, 79.

few, alas! who receive them most abundantly and with the greatest intensity. Their state is usually what is called the mystical state.

3). The Mystical State. The *mystical state* is opposed to the ascetic state from an altogether different standpoint to that presented above. There, the distinction was drawn from a theological point of view; here, the question is of states of soul.

The Ascetic State of Soul is that of the Christian who has begun to make progress towards perfection and advances in virtue, without the assistance of the eminent, mystical graces of which we have just written and which are rarely vouchsafed before the last phase of the illuminative way. Asceticism thus indicates the means the soul is counselled to employ in order to accomplish this progress.

The Mystical State of Soul is that of the Christian who has received, or who is still receiving the eminent graces which are accorded him for the purpose of achieving full perfection, and allows his whole conduct to be guided by these graces. This state of soul is *mixed*. On the one hand it supposes mystical gifts (either actual, or still influencing the soul by their effects) which represent divine *action* in the soul; and on the other hand a very intense *human action* in the soul, which is primarily explained by the ascetical side of Moral Theology, but which in this case must be accounted for by Mystical Theology since these gifts exercise a powerful influence on the whole conduct of the perfect.

There are certain *disadvantages*, however, in placing too much insistence on the divine action to the detriment of that of man: there is the danger of letting it be thought that holiness is characterised more by supernatural favours than by virtues.

It is also better, for the sake of clarity and the avoidance of ambiguity, to define *Ascetical Theology* from the theological standpoint that has been given above, and not from the limited viewpoint of the ascetic state of soul. In this way the whole range of supernatural human action may be considered, even to heights of perfection. As for Mystical Theology, it were prudent to take it in a strict sense as meaning the study of the divine action of the Holy Ghost in souls, to the exclusion of the resulting human action, in spite of the fact that the study of the former action is made for the purpose of controlling and guiding the latter. Mystical Theology relates to ascetical, and the gifts to the virtues.

B. Contemplation.

All the mystical gifts, as has been pointed out above, have their place in contemplation, of which a summary account will be given here. This will be divided as follows: 1. Contemplation in general; 2. contemplation properly so called. This will be of great assistance when we come to speak of *contemplative meditation* which is of the utmost importance for the better understanding of patristic writings.

i. Contemplation In General.

a). Contemplation, in general, is a profound knowledge of God. The Holy Ghost usually vouchsafes it to those Christians who have stripped themselves of their vices and have entrenched themselves in

..... hi order that He may bring them to the state of perfection. Faith, Hope and Charity are rendered perfect by contemplation, whilst being destroyed in any way.

It is called a *profound* knowledge because of its *simplicity* which opposes the ordinary human way of acting; because of its special Method, and, lastly, because of its *object*.

In Contemplation is a simple and intuitive operation. A very simple operation is natural to the mind for the perception of first principles, but normally it does not enter into the action of the Mind concerning any other object. Thus God can not be known intuitively except by the action of God Himself. This is the peculiar condition of the greatest *gifts* of the Holy Ghost: wisdom and understanding.

In The most characteristic feature of contemplation is that it enables the mind to be *touched*, in a manner of speaking. It is, as one might say, *intuitive knowledge of God*. Under the influence of this grace the soul has a deep-seated feeling of the *presence* of God, or better, of its own presence in God; or more simply, the soul possesses a direct and intuitive knowledge of *God's reality*, which even in the midst of the least spiritual aridity binds the human will to the divine will, with a force more than human force. This realism of all true mystical knowledge is beautifully shown most forcefully in the deep feeling of religious veneration which seizes the souls of the saints when they speak of God, or speak of Him in prayer. The origin of this emotion is *wisdom* which, as the *philosophical* word indicates (*sapio, sapientia*) makes God to be tasted, as it were, and enjoyed, and which causes Him to be appreciated above all other beings as the only being really worthy of the name.

It must be noted that this *wisdom* must be accompanied by a certain intuition of the understanding, and will not be perfect without a penetrating apprehension of the divine mysteries. This character, however, is always subordinated to the preceding one. Wisdom and intelligence are the two essential elements of contemplation and are merged in the simplicity of a simple operation. Wisdom, however, possesses the greater dignity. According to Saint Teresa's descriptions, its action is perceived as a more forcefulness before that of intelligence (see below, *contemplation properly so called*). Even at the summit of the spiritual life, however, mystical lights remain subjected to wisdom and love.

The general object of contemplation is the same as the object of faith; the light of the gifts is able to clarify all revealed truths. Nevertheless they are not all enlightened equally and in the same manner. Contemplation as such, tends towards the most elevated object of faith, God Himself, its first object. Inasmuch as all creatures are related to God they come into the confines of faith and contemplation. Therefore, the nearer an object is to God the more it is clarified by the light which comes from Him. Since the Humanity of Christ from every standpoint, even in the most humiliating circumstances to which He had sometimes to submit itself, is ever united to a divine Person, it is itself the most clarified being to the eye of the mystic on account of the

¹ In this, *contemplation* differs from *vision* which, for instance, can have for its object the *Humanity of Christ*. But vision is an extraordinary grace.

graces of which we speak. Even the pages of Holy Scripture, which from a human point of view seem exceedingly simple, possess an inexhaustible doctrinal wealth because they are the word of God. Nevertheless, it is obviously God Himself who is the foremost supernaturally illuminated object in the souls of the perfect, for it is by His rays that all else is illuminated. It is a better understanding of his infinite perfections, and in some sort of the divine Persons themselves, that facilitates a deeper knowledge of the other mysteries, above all that of the Incarnation. *Contemplation*, therefore, may well be *defined* as a profound knowledge of God and of all things in God, in proportion as each creature is nearer to God.

b). There is no need to distinguish *two species* of contemplation, for indeed there exists but one; nevertheless contemplation takes on two very different modalities: *a)* the first of these is that the soul is wholly occupied with contemplation to the extent that all real force is taken away from the inferior activities, or their action is even arrested altogether. This first form is termed *contemplation properly so-called*; it is sometimes called *passive* contemplation (as opposed to active), or yet again *infused* (pre-eminently but not exclusively); *bj* in the second modality, contemplation, although essentially the same as the preceding, is *combined* with a certain discursive activity. This will be dealt with when we speak of *perfect contemplative meditation*. As it may be supposed, the characteristic features of contemplation appear most clearly in the first form.

2. Contemplation properly so-called.

a). The Proper and Spécifié Object, the *direct* and immediate *object*, of contemplation properly so-called, that is to say, of contemplation considered in its essential act, *is God Himself*. It attains Hint by a simple and intuitive operation unaided by the discursive action of the mind. It is for this reason that mystics say that it is produced by the summit of the mind (*apex mentis*). Further, not only is contemplative knowledge given apart from the ordinary discursive operation of the faculties, but of itself it tends to arrest this operation. Thus, intense! contemplation suspends it entirely. But it is not so always and, as we shall see, it is possible to have *contemplation* and activity of the faculties at the same time. This is the case of perfect contemplative! meditation (see below).

b). Usually, these infused lights are given to souls by degrees, by a *progressive series ofgraces*, gradually becoming greater. The stages of this advance have been best described by Saint Teresa.

I. First of all there is *initial* or *imperfect* contemplation which is accorded in the prayer of *recollection* and of *y«r?/(4th Mansion)*. Saint Teresa does not give the name of contemplation to these prayers. In them, God is manifested, not so much in Himself as in His effects and notably by the deep and ineffable peace which reveals His presence. The purpose of these graces is to prepare the soul to enter on the unitive way by developing its love of God. The trial which is described by Saint John of the Cross under the name of *Night ofthe Senses* thus prepares the soul by accustoming it to complete renouncement of self, without which, no one can hope to attain the state of the perfect.

In me and perfect contemplation is described by Saint Teresa in the of *graces* or *prayers of union*, thus called on account of their Ju liar efficacy for riveting and morally uniting the will to God. It is, over, they increase in perfection in proportion as the soul becomes h..... responsive to divine gifts. The *union* which they produce is by pu o *âmpie* (5th Mansion) *intense* or often *estatic* (6th Mansion) and In "th Mansion) *transforming*, when the interior renewal of the flioli man is achieved and when, in the extent which is possible in this Ill: Im exemplifies the words of Saint Paul : *Qui autem aMiceret Domino* ■* i *spiritus est* (I Cor., VI, 17). One of the habitual features of these ■ti' of union which Saint Teresa describes and which differentiates Du hi from the preceding *graces* in which contemplation is imperfect, U that God reveals Himself with special clearness. This happens even Ill the simple union which Saint Teresa compares to an *interview* of the ■Mil with God. The saint is careful to point out that the supernatural ilglit which is received falls directly only on God. "Only the Divinity In lh question", she says, and later she adds, "The soul perceives only In ii mysterious way Him she is about to espouse"'. In the *Life* she ■mploys an even clearer expression: this union gives "understanding ill the pure truth". *Saint John of the Cross* has a similar doctrine, but lh particularly insists on the part played by *simple faith* in the superna- illill illumination of the soul'. This illumination has its origin, unac- Viinpanied by any distinct intellectual conception, either in sweet and bli isant contemplation, or during the superior spiritual trial, the *night »/th, soul* which is a special form of contemplation and prepares the ■lty for a more perfect illumination of the soul by the Holy Ghost. ■ This is no other than the teaching of Saint Augustine. Like Saint Teresa, but with more insistence, the early Doctors, and chiefly those ill the Augustinian school, have treated of the supernatural lights which Hi ompany perfect charity. This is the point of view they most prefer nixl by which they differ from Saint Teresa, who is more concerned with lli< pre-eminently supernatural character of these gifts and the great i "iidscedence of God Who stoops to His creatures in order to lift llim up to Him *

C. Contemplative meditation.

In order to avoid all ambiguity, a clear distinction must be drawn between contemplation and what we will call contemplative meditation. *Meditation* is here to be taken in a wide sense as meaning any in livity of the soul when it employs its powers to raise itself to God and

k ' *Le Château intérieur*, IVe Dem. Œuv. Compl. (French Trans. Carmelites ..I l iris) V. VI, (1910), p. 135, 161.

i ' Ascent of Carmel, bk. II, ch. 2-8.

l ■ *the Dark Night of the Soul*, bk. II.

• *The prayer of simple faith* as described by many modern authors, and particularly by Bossuet in his fine treatise on *The short and easy way of making the puser of faith and the presence of God*, is often a true infused prayer in one or niill r of the forms that have been indicated above. But it may also be but j *simplified* affective or contemplative *meditation*. Although the vague appellilinn. prayer of faith or of simplicity, is useful in practice, it is not always H Hue guide to its real character.

unite itself to Him by affective prayer. Understood in this sense, meditation takes on three forms: discursive, affective or contemplative. a) *Discursive meditation* is that spiritual exercise with which everyone is acquainted, and whose rules have been perfectly defined by the leaders of modern asceticism, notably by Saint Ignatius, Saint Francis of Sales, and M. Olier. 2) *Affective meditation* differs from the preceding inasmuch as it is less bound by method, and affective acts have more place than reflection and reasoning. 3) *Contemplative meditation* is that in which the soul, possessed of a more enlightened faith and a purer and more ardent charity, is able to elevate itself to a *loving consideration of the divine perfections*, either in themselves, or in the Humanity of Christ or in Holy Scripture. It is especially in these latter that God has revealed Himself to us.

We must deal especially with contemplative meditation on account of its close relation to contemplation. Two species may be distinguished: one *imperfect*, the other *perfect*.

2. *Imperfect contemplative meditation* is that in which the soul, aided by its affective acts, gives itself up entirely to those considerations of God which we have just mentioned. It possesses the assistance of ordinary grace, but not that of the superior lights of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. This sort of exercise is a true prayer, an excellent pious practice, but it is no more than a *meditation*. Nevertheless, since it *disposes* the soul for contemplation, it is called *contemplative meditation*. Compared with what is to follow it is *imperfect*.

This imperfect contemplative meditation is often termed *acquired contemplation* by modern authors. There is a draw-back in speaking of it in this way. The name *contemplation* is only applied to it inasmuch as it is but a preparation for contemplation. The word *acquired* seems to hint that there may be true contemplation without any infused element; but this is inexact. With the foregoing reservations, these expressions might be employed. To avoid all uncertainty, however, we will abstain from them.

The expression *active contemplation* is regarded by many authors as being synonymous with *acquired contemplation*. The word *active* has less drawbacks than *acquired*, and can even be used to mean perfect contemplative meditation. If we find that we have occasion to use it, the latter sense only will be implied.

The expression which seems best fitted to give the meaning of what we have called contemplative meditation is the *uplifting of the soul*. The spiritual writings of this kind are well known: Charles Sauve's *Dogmatic uplifting! of the soul*, Bossuet's *Upliftings of the soul in the divine mysteries*, and the *Confessions of Saint Augustine*. These upliftings easily take on the form of a *perfect contemplative meditation*? when they are composed by saints.

3. *Perfect contemplative meditation* differs from the preceding inasmuch as the soul is able to profit, not only by the light of the faith and the help of ordinary grace, but also by the greater enlightenment of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The soul uses its faculties in a normal

* Imperfect contemplative meditation is matter for Ascetical rather than Mystical Theology. Hence it does not concern us here. See the end of our article on *La contemplation augustinienne. (de spirituelle, 1926, Dec.)*

in man, but the Holy Ghost *co-operates* with it, both by means of infused grace and the highest gifts of understanding and wisdom.

At the same time there exists *meditation* characterised by the pre-eminence of the discursive faculties, and *contemplation* due to the pre-eminence of the action of the Holy Ghost. Saint Francis of Assisi, singing his hymn to the sun and inviting the whole of nature to glorify God, as he came from prayer, and Saint Teresa as she composed her burning prayers were neither in a state of purely passive contemplation, but were actively applying the graces which they had derived directly from contemplation. It is possible that contemplation may exist together with the activity of the faculties: contemplation is a simple and intuitive operation due to the movement of the Holy Ghost; it does not limit the co-operation of the discursive powers nor does it necessarily limit their suspension. If it is of a lesser intensity, the faculties are able to act of themselves; indeed they are even endowed with greater power. When this takes place, contemplation not only enlightens the highest part of the soul but also every part of the soul, just as a *perfectly uniform* principle inspires all the arguments of a mind which unravels all the conclusions that can be drawn from it. God is the supreme and universal principle. The soul, therefore, which by means of divine contemplation really possesses "that understanding of pure truth" in which Saint Teresa writes, thinks, speaks and acts in proportion as her faculties have been purified. When a soul has morally become "one with Him" by means of the uplifting influence, it can remain constantly in this attenuated glow of contemplation on condition that it is always responsive to grace. This is the teaching of Saint Theresa in the Interior Castle (7th Mansion). She reproduces that of Saint Augustine.

Since every act which is performed under this supernatural influence is benefited by the light which derives from contemplation, it is clear that contemplative meditation, the quest of God, will benefit more than any other and will really become perfect. A soul which has once found God in contemplation will have no difficulty in finding Him again in its intellectual processes, either in the Humanity of Christ or in Holy Scripture and even in all created things. This perfect contemplative meditation is more allied to contemplation than to meditation, notwithstanding the principle by which it is distinguished from the other. It may well be called *active* contemplation by reason of the part played by the faculties. This is the exact meaning which we will always give in this expression. We can in no way admit the expression *acquired contemplation*.

The reader must be referred to the appropriate treatises for detailed information concerning the signs which show that a soul really enjoys

II, graces which cause perfect contemplative meditation. Some are *negative*; they consist, in short, of a complete absence of all deliberate disorder. Others are *positive*, either morally (such as humility, simplicity, peace, deep Christian feeling, etc.) or intellectually (simple and luminous faith; facility for approaching God through a consideration of His works; a profound knowledge of certain mysteries, chiefly the Incarnation, and a great ease in speaking of them and learning from Him). Only the last features can become really apparent in *literary* knowledge and they are not a perfect guarantee that the author has drawn directly from contemplation, the source of infused graces. It is not

difficult to distinguish a written contemplative meditation from a page of any book on doctrine: but it is not easy to say whether it is perfect or imperfect in the sense we have just indicated. In many of them, however, there is clear evidence of supernatural action.

D. Advantages of these distinctions.

1. However subtle may appear the distinctions we have given above, they are indispensable for anyone who would desire a real understanding of early Christian literature and accord it a just appreciation. A case in point is the Alexandrian Christian *gnosis* whose serious defects should not be allowed to cover up its real worth. Similarly, the Augustinian teaching cannot be understood if no weight is given to the principles which have been exposed here. If the instinct for everything Christian was so finely whetted in the Fathers, the Doctors of the Church and the great theologians, it is because they drank deeply of the supernatural founts of which we have spoken. This instinct is accounted as one of the elements which have contributed in an affective way to the homogeneous development of dogma¹.

2. Certain features of early monastic spirituality will thus take on their true meaning. The prayer of the early monks, the simple, measured and attentive reading of Holy Scripture, has at times been looked on with contempt. The psalm-singing which filled their days has been considered as but the occupation of slothful brains; a prayer of praise, perhaps, but still very much inferior to mental prayer, the way to which is so well prepared by the method of Saint Francis of Sales for instance. In reality, however, the masters who taught these exercises considered them as being true *contemplative meditations*. Often, perhaps, they were imperfect, but they were made in view of contemplation and in fact could easily become true active contemplation, on condition that the soul, by its interior dispositions, was able to obtain from God that higher element by which contemplative meditation is transformed and rendered fruitful and perfect. This supernatural element is developed with special intensity in infused prayer or passive contemplation. As has been said, it can also unite itself to the soul's activity, especially that by which a soul *seeks God* during meditation. It is also by its means that the soul finds God, or rather *finds Him again* in all the creatures in whom He reveals Himself; in Christ especially, Who shows the way to God, and the Scriptures which are His word. This brings to indicate the influence that mysticism has had on the exegesis of the early Doctors.

3. The mystical graces have often aided the spiritual exegesis of the Fathers, but in a sense which must be well understood. Since many of the Fathers' works deal with the Scriptures, we will take the opportunity of explaining the criterion we will use in criticising them, and the expressions that will be employed. Scriptural senses may be divided from a double point of view: that of the *way* by which the ideas are expressed, and that of the *object* which is signified. As regards the *way* in which the ideas are expressed, there are but two senses

¹ See MARIN SOLA, O. P., *L'Evolution homogène du dogme catholique*, I (1924) Fribourg, p. 353-393-

Scriptures: *a*) The literal sense is that which is immediately intended by the word, either in its natural significance (*proper sense*); *b*) the *typical* or *mystical sense* which God intends to convey, not immediately but by means of the reference. *Accentino-* is not, properly speaking, a biblical sense.

If we go on to consider only the *objects* which are signified by the *supra*lines, two kinds of biblical sense may again be distinguished, or, exactly, two kinds of passages of very different import and *tuning*: *a*) *Historical passages* which simply relate a fact; *b*) *Doctrinal* containing in a literal or typical sense a genuine doctrinal *in*lung, either *moral* or *theological* (concerned principally with Christ, *Church*, the Trinity or future life). By means of the mystical *graces* *l*nt possess a special aptitude for observing and appreciating */ these doctrinal senses* proper to the Bible. The real purpose of *p/Zrrrr/ exegesis* is the study of these texts.

These *graces* also enable them to make various *spiritual accommodations*, rich in doctrine, from the non-doctrinal passages of Holy *Scripture*. These accommodations, which are frequently found in the *l*thers, are of two kinds. They are either *theological* and serve for the *struction* of the faithful by means of imagery, symbols or allegories *l*o*ri* from the Bible, or else they are moral for the purpose of *edification*. Although they may have very little exegetical worth, *accommodations* are of great pastoral and religious value. Thus, the Fathers *l*ng use a text having some little relation to their subject, in order *to expound their own teaching* based on Holy Scripture and Tradition.

Accommodations are quite legitimate if the following conditions are observed: 1. They must not be put forward as true biblical senses; 2. They must be based on a true scriptural sense; 3. They must *only* be of some spiritual use to the faithful. This last condition is *usually* always present in the works of the Fathers, thanks to their great *devotion* with regard to God and the union of the soul with Him, *l* explains why many works possess a considerable *mystical content*. *l*nn very little genuine exegetical worth. In the absence of the first *l*l... *l*ilion, spiritual accommodations are *dangerous; arbitrary* in the *l*ne of the second; and *mediocre* and *meaningless* if the third is *l*king.

Under cover of works of spiritual exegesis, these mystical accommodations often consist of contemplative meditations of which we have *l*ready written. Indeed the exaltation which fills the last three books of Saint Augustine's *Confessions*, the lively outpouring of love which *l*n found God in Himself and in His works, are endeavours of this *l*timi, applied to the first chapters of Holy Scripture. Bossuet's *Uplifting of the soul on the divine mysteries*, also, often present a fine moral *l*nd spiritual commentary on various passages of Holy *l*rit. There *l*no doubt that in many of these writings one perceives the labours of *l* soul seeking to rise and being gradually uplifted, but in many of

The spiritual doctrines, which the Fathers often based on scriptural passages *l*... use they saw in them some relation to the truths they wished to expound, *l*mi*l*it be termed the *mystical sense* were it not for the fact that this expression *l* usually taken as having another signification.

them, and particularly in Saint Augustine, no trace of effort remains ; the eagle has reached the heights, and hovers effortless.

The soul, which has once *found* God interiorly by contemplation properly so-called, *finds* Him *again* without difficulty in *contemplative meditation* which thus becomes *perfect*, and the accommodation of the sacred text which is then made, also becomes perfect of its kind.

It is clear, then, that the general theory we have outlined has numerous *applications* in many spheres. Those we have indicated suffice to show its usefulness : others will have their place as we treat of each author. The whole theory itself is but the development of two principles which seem to be the substance of Saint Augustine's ideas on this subject: God who is the primary object of faith is also the proper and specific object of contemplation. There is a certain type of prayer in which man's discursive processes are assisted and raised higher by superior graces which derive directly from contemplation.

5. The preceding distinctions have yet another and last advantage. They permit a short definition of two remarkable *doctrinal tendencies* which are found in many of the more outstanding of the Fathers, i. e., *moralism* and *mysticism*. "Mysticism" is the tendency to insist on one or other of the mystical aspects of the Christian life and also, in a general way, divine action in the soul, particularly the profound knowledge of God which results from it. "Moralism" is rather the tendency to insist on man's duties, the actions which, in the moral sphere, lead to union with God: in a word, all we have indicated with regard to Ascetical/Theology. The moralism of Saint John Chrysostom may thus be compared with the mysticism of Saint Augustine or the Alexandrians. In any case, it should be clear that there is no opposition between these two tendencies. They should be considered rather as completing each other. It will indeed be found that they are thus combined to a greater or less extent in the writings of the greatest Doctors and even in the two we have just had occasion to mention.

BOOK I.

The Origins of Patristic Literature.

(First Period: 1st, 2nd and 3rd Centuries).

FIRST PART.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

FIRST CHAPTER.

The Apostolic Fathers in General.

I. CHARACTER OF THE APOSTOLIC WRITINGS.

The *non-canonical* writings which were composed during the first two Christian generations, that is to say, during the first years of the first century and the first half of the second, called *Apostolic*. Should they be known, their authors are termed Apostolic Fathers. These men, if they were not Apostles themselves, are deemed to have been closely associated with them or else their immediate disciples. As we have said, their works are *extra-canonical*, for Patrology does not concern itself with inspired writings. Nevertheless it is quite possible that they were written by the Apostles: it is thought by many that a case in point is the *Apostles' Creed*, which occupies a leading place among all the Apostolic Writings. Several of these writings have been included in the Canon of Holy Scripture, at various times, and in different countries; subsequently, however, they have all been removed from it. If, at times, other writings besides the Apostles'

[1] The most convenient critical edition of the Apostolic Fathers is that of K. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* (2nd ed.), Tübingen, 1901, with introductions and indices. There is a simpler edition of the same author in G. Krüger's collection, *unimlun^.. Quellenschriften* 1906. The *Textes et Documents* collection explains the whole series in several volumes, together with introductions and important notes.

Creed have been ascribed to the Apostles, this should be taken loosely as meaning that they are reproductions of the Apostles' teaching or draw their inspiration from it.

The authority of the Apostolic Fathers and their writings is important at the present time, when the doctrinal controversy between Catholics, Protestants and rationalists is especially centered on the early years of Christianity. They are the first witnesses to the early faith. And they are reliable witnesses, not only on account of the period during which they lived, but also because of the character of their works; their writings are not the fruit of their own personal speculations, but are a true reflection of the circumstances which surrounded them, the ideas and daily life of the Christians of that time. Their authority is thus greater than their intrinsic worth. From a human standpoint it is true that they are *inferior* to the canonical writings, whose inspiration and depth of feeling they lack. They are also inferior to the greater number of subsequent writings, both from a literary and philosophical point of view. Their value consists in the fact that they are the immediate echo of the Apostles' teaching.

This *echo of the Apostles' teaching* is shewn in particular by the abundance of scriptural quotations: these are drawn! not only from the Old Testament, but also from the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament, many passages of which are woven together. This is the case in the *Didache*, particularly in the first six chapters; in Saint Clement's Letter to the Corinthians and in Saint Ignatius' Letters. The Apostolic Fathers had not yet a definitely fixed canon of the New Testament (sometimes they quote the Apocrypha) nevertheless they quote the authentic writings of the Apostles, accompanied by the same expression they employ when introducing the texts of the Law or the Prophets; (scriptum est, γέγραπται). This goes to show that they ascribed a similar authority to both. Moreover, they recognise the *part played by the Church* in safeguarding the revealed deposit of Faith: Saint Ignatius urges the faithful to follow the rulings of their bishops both in matters of faith and discipline. Lastly, the Apostolic Fathers sometimes allude to certain sayings of Christ or the Apostles which have come to them not by way of written tradition but by simple oral transmission. This is particularly noticeable in Papias and the elders (presbyteri).

There is very little method in the doctrine of the Apostolic Fathers. Nevertheless, it may be reduced to a series of *fundamental ideas* around which seem to gravitate the deep-seated convictions of these men, whose supernaturally enlightened simple faith enabled them to take a collected view of them all. The bases of their doctrine are: the mystery of *one God* who was at the same time Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and the mystery of *Christ*, Son of God and true man; in a word the Trinity and the Incarnation. In addition, the Church, a Christian Society organised hierarchically with full powers in the name of God. These are the general means of sanctification. Finally, a *moral teaching* strongly tinged with *asceticism* in the religion of these fathers of Christian literature.

These points will be developed more at length as each is treated. A general outline, however, may well be given here. It will act as a unifying principle for the various particular instances that will be touched upon: it will put before us an idea of the intellectual atmosphere in which the Apostolic Fathers moved, and also enable us to read their works with profit.

II. THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOSTOLIC WRITINGS.

A) The Trinitarian and Christological Doctrine.

1. The Apostolic Fathers' Trinitarian doctrine is that which appears in the Apostles' Creed or baptismal symbol. The latter is of great importance "in the history of dogma and especially in the history of the dogma of the Trinity. With the exception of the inspired books, no other document has had an influence which can compare with it", observes Father •Tineton'. The Nicæan Creed itself, which marks the beginning of a new period in the history of dogma, is derived from a baptismal symbol and is identical in substance to the Roman one. The definition of the *consubstantiality* of the Son with the Father, which is a distinguishing feature of the Nicæan Creed, is but a more explicit rendering of the doctrine which was taught implicitly in the previous formulas. In these, the three Persons were named in a very definite

[1] Le Breton, *Le dogme de la Trinité dans l'ancienne Eglise chrétienne*, *l.-h. Sc. Rel.*, vin (1918), p. 33.

order, but were considered as possessing the same transcendental life and honoured with the same cultus.

This Trinitarian doctrine is asserted simply, unhesitatingly and without further probings by the Apostolic Fathers. But with the more philosophical-minded apologists it already takes on a certain speculative note which is accentuated by the first theologians during the following century. The Fathers do no more than transcribe the Trinitarian expressions of the New Testament. The seventh chapter of the *Didache* twice employs the form of Baptism in the name of the three Persons. Similarly, *Saint Clement*, when persuading the faithful to live in peace and avoid dissension, invoke the common belief in one God, one Christ and one Holy Ghost (ἡ οὐνί ενα θεόν ἔχοριεν καὶ ενα Χριστόν καὶ εν πνεύμα τῇβ γάρπιτο).¹ Texts of this kind may also be found in *Ignatius*². In one passage the unusual order in which the three Persons are named, viz : the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost, is explained by the context. According to the *Martyrium Polycarpi* (XIV, 3) the Bishop of Smyrna glorified the Father by the Son (δι ου σοι... δόξα) but also with the Son and the Holy Ghost (συν αὐτω καὶ Πνευματι). The Odes of Solomon also contain several interesting expressions, in particular the Ode XXIII, 20, although here the mention of the Son and the Holy Ghost may be a later addition³. The Divinity of the three Persons is implied in the passages that have just been quoted⁴. (The teaching of *Hernias* will be dealt with later).

2. The divinity of Christ is no less clearly asserted in the Apostolic Fathers. It was, indeed, the essential note of the Christian catechesis : and some Christians were so impressed by the insistency given to this dogma that they began to doubt the reality of Christ's humanity. The Docetism (from δοκω, to appear), teaching that the Body of the Saviour was but an illusion, made such rapid progress at the beginning of the second century, particularly in Asia Minor, that *Saint Ignatius* was led to take action against it. Thus in all his letters to the Eastern Churches he insists firmly

¹ 1 Cor. XLVI, 6. "As God liveth and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth and I the Holy Spirit (Ζ·jj γάρ ὁ θεός καὶ ζ·q ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον...), *ibid.* Lxvi, 2.

■ Eph. IX, 1 : Magn. XIII, 1.

• See also Ode xtx, 1-5.

• See J. Tixeront, *itisi. Dogm.* 1, p. 124-125.

III. tact that Jesus is truly man. The efforts he made in
H" I.liming this truth have also made of him the first
v "hi/ian of *Our Lady*, whose divine motherhood and vir-
il il conception he defends ». At the same time, however,
|ti>ti Ignatius expressly asserts the divinity of Jesus, calling
Im variously, God (ὁ Θεός, Stnvr. I.), my God (ὁ Θεός μου,
. vi.), our God (ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, Eph. Insc.), God Jesus
Im t (Θεός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Trail. VII.), and thus making use
what theologians came to term "communication of
Inins". The other Apostolic Fathers have a similar
niiine. *Saint Clement of Rome's** affirmations are as
k ipiivocal as those of the Bishop of Antioch. The author
| what is called the *Epistle of Barnabas* treated the Scrip-
Ik . as Docetism treated the humanity of Christ; never-
lf- s its exaggerated allegorical and spiritual interpretations,
Inch suppress the literal sense, show by their very excess
k depth of his faith in the divinity of the Saviour.

B) The Church.

The *Church* is the great work of Christ. The Apostolic
killers are the first witnesses to the *interior life*. Our know-
Mie of its early organisation is due to them. From the
Div beginning we see it as a solidly established society
In... growing *hierarchy* is based on a certain authority
living its source in God 3. From the beginning of the
hndd century this hierarchy is composed of three degrees,
μ h in the local Churches 4. There is no doubt that even
«un the beginning a hierarchy of three degrees existed in
Urial of the great Churches (Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome,
I, but it is possible that it was not to be found everywhere
l; the end of the first century. In certain regions the local
triarchy might consist only of two degrees, a bishop,
lum diate successor of the Apostles, continuing to guide and
il as they had done, the churches of a particular district
|th li as a missionary bishop does in our own times. His
il-, however, was quite distinct from that of those who
, sed the "charismatic" gift of speeches. In any case

* I |ili. vu, Smyr. i.

• the whole Ch. XXXVi of his Letter. The author is influenced by the
|o/i/ i lo the Hebrews, I, 3-13.

• Sr< St. Clement, ch. iv.

• ?■ St. Ignatius, ch. v.

• M the Didache, ch. in.

the words, *bishop*, *priest*, had not been clearly defined at the end of the first century.

The Church does not only possess an external and social authority. It has also at its disposal the means of sanctification established by Christ and is, as it were, charged with their stewardship. Elementary but very valuable information may be found in the Apostolic Fathers regarding the Christian *rites*; *Baptism*, the *Holy Eucharist* and *Penance*. The *Pastor of Hermas*, in particular, contains a great deal concerning the last mentioned, although his ideas are not as precise as they might be.

C) Moral Teaching.

Moral teaching enters extensively into the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. They are all agreed in substance, but each one of them has its own special features. In the *Didache* this teaching is in a *very simple form*, consisting of a series of precepts drawn from Holy Scripture and given in its very words. In the Letter of *Saint Clement* it has already become more *precise*, and indeed almost scholarly if it is considered from the point of view of the motives which are put forward. With *Saint Ignatius* it is permeated with a pure and *splendid mysticism*, not only in the Letter to the Romans but also in all his Letters: it is but the normal expansion of the closest supernatural union with Christ, which in its turn is based on the Bishop of Antioch's profound supernatural knowledge of Christ: this is essentially one of the fundamental characters of true Christian mysticism.³

Saint Ignatius' strong personality, which is enhanced by the transports of his mysticism, gives us the impression of a fighter; traces of this may be seen in his teaching. But there is one "Apostolic" writing wherein Christian life is expressly likened to a *spiritual combat*. This is the Homily, termed the second Letter of Saint Clement. Hennis lays even more stress on this *ascetical tendency*; he takes encratism, in the very orthodox meaning of ascetism, and makes a deal enough distinction moreover between the precepts which are binding on all and the counsels which are given to the

¹ See the Two Ways.

² See above, p. 35.

³ See the Introduction, p. 19 and p. 20-24.

It is not. A similar teaching is found in the two letters "*Ad Romanos*" of another Pseudo-Clement. Proposing to give instructions of both sexes advice concerning the dangers proper to their estate, the author eloquently describes the greatness of their vocation and the obligations it implies. If these first Christians were so fervent, it was because they were hurried up by the desire of a closer union with Christ and the possession of his kingdom. Their belief in the imminence of the *Second Coming* was but an exaggeration of the firmness of their hope. This early ascetism then, had its roots in a lively and confident faith: the moral teaching was a natural complement to the teaching of dogma.

CHAPTER II.

The Apostles' Creed.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

I. I. Critical edition: Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, p. 1-9.

■ Special articles: P. Batiffol, *Apôtres (Symbole des)* in *Diet. Bibl.*, col. 1660-1673. A. Vacant, *ibid.* col. 1673-1680. E. Vacandard, *l'Écriture (Symbole des)* in *Diet. Apol.*, col. 272-283; and *Études de Patristique et d'hist. rei.* I, *Les Origines du symbole des Apôtres*. G. Voisin, *l'Écriture du symbole des Apôtres* in the *Rev. Hist. Etc.*, III (1902) 323; the same author has also dealt with the work of Kattenbusch, *l'Écriture* later, *ibid.* II (1901) p. 88-97. J. Lebreton, *La formation du symbole des Apôtres*, in *Rech. Sc. Rei.* XLII (1923), p. 349-353. J. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, I, p. 68-76. *Pat.*, I, 36-39. J. Tixeront, *mil. Dogm.*, p. 165-168.

THE AUTHORITY AND THE TEXT

OF THE APOSTLES' CREED.

I. I. In the Apostles' Creed must take first place among those writings which are usually termed Apostolic. We will leave for the moment the question of its supposed composition by the Apostles themselves. We will lose no time, however, in pointing out the features which entitle it to be given special consideration. It would be an exaggeration to say that it was inspired and rank it with Holy Scripture,

1. A. Vacant, *Diet. th. eath.*, col. 1680.

2. E. Chamard's opinion, *Rev. Quest. Hist.*, April, 1901.

even if it were the work of the Apostles, (it has never been considered a canonical writing by the Church). But on the other hand it is not enough to denounce the Protestant view which affirms that because it is more explicit than the Gospel on many points it has no doctrinal value. This rule of faith which the Church imposes on the neophytes in the solemn administration of Baptism is regarded by her as an official document of her belief. "Although this liturgical and catechetical monument is not in its present form a synodal and theological document, it is the infallible expression of the daily teaching of the Church, and all the doctrinal points therein are as binding as the Catholic Faith and consequently under pain of heresy", observes A. Vacant.

This Creed has been the subject of innumerable *camenentaries*. The first of these among Patristic literature are those of Rufinus, and Nicetas of Remesiana in the West and those of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem in the East. Furthermore, both Saint Augustine and Saint Peter Chrysologus have a number of well-known homilies dealing with this subject *.

For the last sixty years the Apostles' Creed has been the object of widespread critical research. Caspari the Norwegian, was the first in the field with three outstanding essays, of which the conclusions have been summarised by Hahn in his "Library of Creeds" †. More recently still, F. Kattenbusch ‡ has completed this research in a book yet more noteworthy than Caspari's; while in England A. Burn § has pursued similar studies. Although everything which is found in these critical works cannot be accepted without question, many of the historical conclusions are of undoubted value. An account of these may be read in the articles of Mgr. Batiffol and Vacandard, listed above.

The text which is admitted at present by no means dates from the beginning of the Church. There is an appreciable difference between it and the text given in the commentary of Rufinus of Aquileia, written about 404 and the first to be known in the West. This may be observed in the following quotation 6, in which the words which are lacking in Rufinus' text are placed in brackets and the words which differ from the present text in parenthesis.

* See the chapters dealing with each of these authors.

‡ *Ungedruckte... Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregeln* Christiania, 1886; 1869-1875.

§ *Bibliothek der symbols und Glaubensregeln der Allen Kirche*, Breslau, 1871 (2nd ed. 1897).

¶ *Das Apostolische Symbol*, 2. vol., Leipzig, 1894-1900, p. 410 and 1061 (See Voisin, *loc. cit.*).

§ *Apostles' Creed*, London, 1906.

6 See Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, p. 2, 6.

A i) Credo in [z/zz«,,z] Deum ', " Patrein "3 omnipotentem, [*creatorem* 'K ,7 /irra-].

II. 2) et in Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unicum, Dominum nostrum ; jin conceptus (*natus*) est de Spiritu Sancto, [zza/zzrj ex Maria h nie ; 4) passus (*crucifixus*) sub Pontio Pilato, [*crucifixus*], [*mortuus*] '■pullus; [*descendit ad inferos*]; 5) tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; j 'endit ad cælos, sedet ad dexteram [Dei] Patris [*omnipotentis*]; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.

< 8) [*Credo*] (*et*) in Spiritum Sanctum; 9) sanctam Ecclesiam *thoUcam*] [sanctorum communionem] 10) remissionem peccatorum ;) carnis resurrectionem ; 12) [et vitam æternam].

II. HISTORY OF THE CREED IN THE WEST: ITS ORIGINS.

The *text of Rufinus* is called the Roman texts as opposed the *Gallican* text. This latter is the one actually in use; i ; found almost entire in the work of Saint Caesarius Arles (d. 543) and also, for the greater part of it, in that Nicetas of Remesiana (beginning of the fifth century), lit variants in use in the different Churches were finally timed to a single formula, which, at an unknown date k ral centuries later, found its way into the Roman liturgy, i. in the latter that the Gallican *Credo* has taken the place llu- *Roman symbol* which was still highly considered in l mirth century, not only at Rome, but also at Milan, at ileia, and in Africa (where Saint Augustine chose to nutate it in preference to the African symbol). In any m . all the various Western Creeds can be reduced to inge type, that of Rome, which according to all the in- is the common source of them all. Scraps of it may l unid in the *third century* authors (in the letters of the ipi , in Novatians' *De Trinitate* and in Tertullian), and llmse of the *second century* (Saint Irenaeus and Saint Min, for instance)⁴. It should be noted that some held th a fair amount of probability that the early Creed had l words : *Credo in unum Deum*; the word *unum* being l k <l at the beginning of the third century on account of Monarchian error. Some authors are inclined to think

A niant of Rufinus' text lias all the substantives governed by *Credo* in the Ulo *Credo in Deo, Paire*, etc.

l i *Ihum* and *Palrem* see below, *History of the Creed*.

ll., oldest text of the Creed is in the Greek. It is to be found in the ellition which Marcellus of Ancyra addressed to Pope Julius and which ii l piphanius includes in his treatise *On the heresies* LXXii, 3.

I' Hλ γπιοι., *loe. cil.*, col. 166,-1673; Vacandakd, *loe. cil.*, p. 37-45.

that it was then that the word *Patrem* was added: but it is equally probable that this word was a part of the original composition. Recent critics suppose it to have been composed in Rome in the middle of the second century (Harnack), or even at its beginning, about 100-120 (Kattenbusch) 2. They consider the Creed to be an *Apostolic* writing in the wide sense, ranking with the other literary works of the two first Christian generations.

These conclusions, which meet with favour at the hands of some Catholic scholars, are considered insufficient by others; who tend to connect the Roman *Creed* more intimately with the Apostles. It is related by Rufinus that, *according to tradition (tradunt majores nostri)*, the Apostles, before they dispersed, received from Christ the injunction to compose a rule of faith for the purpose of safeguarding the unity of teaching in the Church. This they did, collaborating under divine inspiration, and gave it the name of *symbol* 3. Later, it was even supposed that it was they who divided it into twelve articles, each one composed by an Apostle, whose name was given. The first evidence of this opinion is found in two sermons of the sixth century wrongly ascribed to Saint Augustine. Even at the end of the nineteenth century, a number of Catholic authors maintained this tradition to the very letter. Dom Chaman went as far as deducing the inspiration of the Creed from the supposed premiss of its composition by the twelve Apostles 4, and by so doing gave an opening to those who contest its Apostolic origin.

Various Catholic scholars, however, have endeavoured to steer a middle course, by making certain concessions to the critics, while still *retaining in substance the account of Rufinus*. They attribute the Creed to Saint Peter and Saint Paul, the founders of the Church at Rome. The Abbé Fouard declares this to be beyond all doubt. M. Voisin has restated this opinion with the help of new arguments but goes no further than saying it is probable. He supports

1 P. Batiffol, *loc. cit.*, col. 1670-1671.

2 Voisin, *loc. cit.*, (1902) p. 302. Caspari thought that the Creed had its origin at the time of the Apostles or a little after, in those regions of Asia Minor which had been influenced by Saint John.

3 Vacant, *Did. thiol.*, col. 1678.

4 Rev. Quest. Hist., April 1901, p. 341-343.

5 Voisin, Rev. Hist. Etc., 1902, p. 297-298; 300; 316-323.

In 'pinion with these reasons : the Creed betrays no signs ni dependence on canonical literature, which would be hr plicable were it due to a later author; its doctrine is l «Imple, containing no allusions to rising heresies; no theolo- ■i .ll speculation ; the Christology is above all historical, with Kli< ideas and the style of the Gospels. All of this is entirely ||n keeping with an Apostolic environment. Furthermore, llin need of such a formulary was felt, right from the ■eginning, for the use of the catechumens: if that was its felirpose, it is not difficult to understand why it was modified lu i certain districts to suit the exigencies of catechetical Benching. Lastly, if the Creed originated in Rome, it is Lli ir why it finds no mention in the *Didache*; nor does the Blence of Saint Clement prove anything, since he had no fcitson for citing this document*. M. Voisin concludes: r'lii the absence of fresh documents which would permit lni the solution of this difficult problem, the most sure opinion lin lhat which holds the Creed to have been composed in Bl-une while the Apostles were yet living”².

I ll. *Vacanti* also believes that the Creed was Apostolic In origin. Nevertheless, he makes certain reservations. ll suppose that the essential part, that is to say, the ■lofession of faith in the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which ■mins the original framework of the whole, is a baptismal fminulary due to the Apostles, while the *secondary elements* which fill in this framework are later additions culminating In the form we know to-day. This form is more recent, but it' important, than the assertion of belief in the Trinity, which, declares the author, is undoubtedly due to the ftiistles, notably Saints Peter and Paul in Rome.

I According to the more recent Catholic works of criticism, it is feasible ln i (insider the Apostles' Creed as the combination of *two Apostolic* fi'<w, the one Trinitarian in substance and the other Christological. lln- essential features of the early catechesis concerning the two great Plm .tian mysteries are thus summarised in one composition. It is to ln opposed that these two forms were at first used separately, being Hlriged together in the Trinitarian framework at the beginning of the Hui4 century with a view to providing a more vigorous opposition to the bhiii;: Monarchian heresy⁴.

I ' Voisin, *Rev. Hist. Ecc.*, 1901, p. 95.

I . *Hid.*, (1902), p. 323.

I l *Diet. thiol.*, *loc. cit.*, col. 1675-1676.

I l-Iuher Lebreton considers this “hypothesis” to be *teally probable* in the ■.....it he gives of it in the *Rech. Setene. Rei.*, 1923, p. 353.

III. THE APOSTLES' CREED IN THE EAST.

No less than in the West, *various creeds* existed in the East during the fourth century. The best known are that of *Cæsarea*, which was adopted and completed ¹ by the Nicene Fathers, and that of Jerusalem ², revised in conformity with the Nicene articles and which was specially approved at the Council of Constantinople (381) on account of the exactness of its expression regarding the Holy Ghost. It became what is known as the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. Besides these formularies, however, there existed a great many others which it has been possible to reduce to various types ³ j Palestinian, Syrian and Mikrasiatic ³. The critics have been led to conclude that there was no fixed type of creed in use in the East before the end of the third century, at which period they suppose the Apostles' Creed to have been introduced. Mgr. Batiffol is of the opinion that it was the Council of Nicæa which made the latter formulary known in the East, and that previously these Churches had only employed a very succinct Trinitarian form.

There are some who, while maintaining divergent views among themselves, are at one in rejecting this last opinion, since they ascribe the Apostles' Creed, in a strict sense! to the Apostles themselves. Nevertheless, even those, who with M. Voisin ⁴ think that the Creed was entirely due to the Apostles and originated at Rome, regard it as having spread fairly rapidly through the whole Church : in the East, however, more attention was paid to its dogmatic content, with the result that the Trinitarian formulary was the first to be developed. The other Eastern symbols or creeds are ■but a development of this ⁵.

¹ According to Eusebius : See *Diet, thiol.*, art. *Arianisme*, col. 1796.

■ According to Saint Cyril of Jerusalem: See *Diet, thiol.*, art. S. Cyrille, -col. 2540 : Denzinger-B., l. c., p. 7.

³ *Diet, thiol.*, art. *Apôtres (Symbole des)*, col. 1668-1670.

⁴ Voisin, *R. Hist. Ecc.*, 1901, p. 92-95; 1902, p. 312.

⁵ See Lbbreton, *Rech. Sc. Rei.*, t. vni (1918), p. 8-35, for an account of the outstanding importance of the Creed from the point of view of the history ■of dogma, and particularly the dogma of the Trinity before the Council of Nicæa.

CHAPTER III.

The Didache.

I. LITERAL Bibliography.

Hi Editions: X. Funk, *Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum*, 1887; and K. Apostolici, 1901. J. SCHLECHT, *Doctrina XII Apostolorum*, Hiini!; ini B., 1900. Hemmer-Laurent, *Les Pires Apostoliques Hill Text. Docum.*, Paris, 1907.

H) Articles and Studies: E. Jacquier, *La Doctrine des douze* ■^ii/ii't, Paris, 1891; *Apôtres (Doctrine des Douze)* in the *Diet, thiol.*, KI 1080-1687. H. Leclerq, *Didaché*, in the *Diet. Arch.*, col. 772-798. Hiyy detailed bibliography as far as 1913). P. Batiçfol, *L'Eglise Uimrnte et le cdtli.*, p. 125-132; *Etudes*, 2nd series, *L'Eucharistie*, ■ 6. A. MICHELIS, *L'Origine de I<!piscopai*, p. 199-209. O. Bar-mt:ll EWER, *Pat.* 1. p. 39-43. J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I. (isted.), D | II' 53 > fot'l ed.) p. 121 and sq.

I. HISTORY OF THE DIDACHE.

I The short treatise named the Didache or "Doctrine of ili< Apostles" possesses a double title: Διδαχή των δώδεκα βι.νστόλων (Doctrina duodecim Apostolorum) or Διδαχή R · > διά των δώδεκα Ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἐθέουσιν (Doctrina Domini lifiitibus per duodecim Apostolos). It would seem that the 't title is an abridgement of the second and probably iijpjjial title. The expression, "Doctrine of the Apostles", mu ans an *abstract of the Apostles' teaching* rather than H *summary* composed by the Apostles themselves.

I The complete text of this little book of religious instruction tva discovered in 1873 by Bryennios, Greek Orthodox Khiropolitan of Nicomedia, in the Jerusalem codex (1057) limi published by him in 1883. Previous to his edition the Wink was not entirely unknown, for it is mentioned and ipioled by Clement of Alexandria and Origen. In fact it ln · une so popular in the Early Church that at times it was tinnight to be inspired, with the result that Eusebius was uh ed to place it among the νόθα (spuria). Saint Athanasius K i mnmends it to the catechumens as being extremely useful. It was also copied and paraphrased in various canonical « niks of a later date.

In addition to the Greek text published in 1883, there Kmain two *fragments of the Didache*, one in Latin, "The

Two Ways" (published by Schlecht), and the other in Arabic, embodied in the life of Schnoudi (d. 451).

The author is unknown. It would seem that he utilised various previous works, particularly the little moral treatise entitled "The Two Ways", which has also been a source of inspiration to other writers. In any case the different parts have been most pleasingly blended together. There is no ground for thinking that "The Two Ways" is Jewish in origin.

In all probability the Didache was composed between 70 and 90, although some critics would place the date of its composition in 120 or 150. The primitive condition of the liturgy and of the hierarchy described therein is an inducement to place the Didache as near as possible to the Apostolic times and to look upon it as the earliest known work of Christian Antiquity. The place of composition was undoubtedly the *East*, either Syria, Palestine or Egypt.

The contents of this work are a sufficient indication of its *nature*. It is neither a simple instruction manual for catechumens nor a simple *rituale* (liturgy is given but little space). It would appear more exact to term it a kind of *summary* of the moral, individual and social obligations of the first Christians, the faithful (and also, according to many, of the heads of the community).

II. ABSTRACT OF THE DIDACHE.

The Didache is a short treatise divided into sixteen chapters, which fall naturally into *three parts* and an *epilogue* :

1. A moral catechism (ch. I-vi);
2. A liturgical instruction (vn-x);
3. Disciplinary regulations (xi-xv);
4. An instruction on the Parousia (xvi).

A) The moral catechism is often termed the *book of the Two Ways* since it reduces all the duties of a Christian to two ways : *the Way of life* (ch. I-iv); and *the Way of death* (ch. v); chapter VI concludes the Two Ways.

a). *The Way of life* comprises four classes of duty:

1. *The basic duty* of the love of God and our neighbour, which includes the love of our enemies and liberality in the exercise of charity (1).

2. *Personal duties*, consisting in the avoidance of evil (II-III, 6), particularly sensuality, cruelty and superstition ; and also involving the practice of virtue (tn, 7-10).

Sodai duties (iv): respect for the representatives of God and imitance of peace among the faithful (1-4), generosity to the poor i, education of children and the mild government of servants (9-11).

i i *The obligation of confessing one's sins* (tv, 12-14).

I b i *The Way of death* (v) is that which consists in giving way to the Mi enumerated above. A second list of sins given in this chapter is a ■(ilici t examination of conscience.

I e *End of the moral catechesis* (vt): exhortation to keep in the Way Mln' h leads to perfection and to abstain from meats offered to idols.

I i i *The liturgical instruction* (ch. vn-x) deals with Baptism (vn), Juning and prayer (vni) and the Holy Eucharist (ix-x).

I η i *Baptism* may only be conferred after a previous moral instruction. Ill i to be administered with the proper form, in living water, if it can fin had, if not, in cold or even hot water: if there is not sufficient water Bit immersion, it may be poured thrice on the head. The baptised must nnt lor at least one day previously (vn).

I b *Prayer and fasting*: fasts are not to be on Monday and Thursday Mwuh the hypocrites" (the Jews), but on Wednesday and Friday. Nor Mm t Christians pray as do the hypocrites, but they shall say the Our will lier thrice a day with the doxology (ὅτι σοι εἰσιν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δόξα K οὐ αἰῶνα) quia tibi est fortitudo et gloria in saecula (vili).

■ ci. *The Eucharist*: The Eucharistic repast must be preceded by two ■livers or invocations, the one over the chalice and the other over the Broken bread (κλάσμα). Only those who have been baptised in the mimic of the Lord shall eat and drink of the Eucharist (ix). Another ■rayer forms the thanksgiving after the communion, and is ended with llin liturgical formulary: Maran Atha (The Lord cometh) (I. *Cor.*, xvi, K, *Apoc.*, xxil, 20). Those possessing the prophetic gifts may give hli inks for as long, and in what manner, they desire (x).

Disciplinary regulations (ch. xi-xv). These concern : a) The obligations of the community regarding the teachers and doctors (Xi); > l lie obligations of charity (xn-xni); c) The internal government of jIn (immunity (xiv-xv).

I ii i. *Obligations concerning the spiritual teachers* (Xi):

i *The preachers* are to be received if they teach the above doctrine I(ġ-ġ).

I *Travelling Apostles* are to be well received, but if they stay more Hinn two days or ask for money, they are false prophets (3-6).

i *The true prophets* must not be judged when they speak in the Ipiit: they are false prophets, however, «) if they eat from a table they Ill. l previously ordered, while in the spirit, to be prepared for them; ») il they do not practise what they preach; c) if they give certain signs di their mission, or counsel them to others, of which God alone is the tilnlgc; d) if they ask for money while in the spirit(7-ia).

I b). *Obligations of charity* (x ii-x h i):

■ i *ZZZ travellers* are to be received unconditionally should they come «inly for two or three days: if they wish to remain in the community, ithry must work.

2. Teachers and prophets are worthy of their food. Firstfruits are to be given to the prophets for "they are your High Priests" (ἀρχιερεί); but if there is no prophet, firstfruits must be given to the poor.

C). *The internal government of the community* (xiv-xv) comprises three obligations:

1. An *assembly on Sunday* for the purpose of the Breaking of the Eucharistic Bread, a true sacrifice (Θυσία). This supposes the confession of transgressions and the making up of quarrels.

2. The *election of leaders* (episcopi and diaconi) worthy of the Lord, for they fulfil the ministry of the prophets and the teachers.

3. Fraternal *correction* of the members of the community, and concord and peace among all.

D). *Epilogue: The Parousia or Second Coming* (ch. xvi) exhorts to watching, perseverance and mutual aid in preparation for the last period when the false prophets will be multiplied and the seducer of the world will come forth. But it is then also that the signs of truth shall be shown (The opened heavens, the trumpet and the resurrection) when the Lord will come on the clouds of heaven.

HI. DOCTRINE OF THE DIDACHE.

After this detailed abstract there is no need of insisting on all the doctrinal teaching that is contained in this little treatise. A few observations on the following should suffice: I. Dogma and moral; 2. Ecclesiastical offices; 3. The Sacraments and the liturgy; 4. The Parousia.

A). *Dogma and moral.* It will have been noticed that this work is eminently practical. It does not contain the baptismal symbol, even in an elementary and abridged form. Nevertheless it contains an implicit teaching of all the essential truths of the faith which are contained in the early Creed. The *moral teaching*, on the other hand, is well developed and imparted with a remarkable sureness of touch. This teaching already possesses its own precise principles (The *hook of the Two Ways*) and is not dependent on the inspiration of the preachers (ch. XI). A clear distinction is drawn between *precepts* which are binding on all and *counsels* which are the condition of perfection (I, 4; VI). Christian moral teaching is based on the love of God (I), and supposes above all the avoidance of the pagan vices (II, Hi, v), the fulfilment of the obligations of one's state (iv), work (xii), love of our neighbour (xii). Lastly, it requires that all shall take an active part in the life of the Christian community according to the indications in the liturgical and disciplinary parts of the treatise.

i Ecclesiastical orders '. According to the Didache
H h exist two kinds of ecclesiastical orders: the first are
In i of the itinerant ministers possessing *charismatic* and
hii (ordinary gifts; the second concern the *local hierarchy*.

i. The charismatic orders of which the *Didache* speaks
h' three in number, the *Apostles* (XI, 4), the *prophets* (XI, 9),
Hil the *doctors* (XII, 2, XV, 1-2). These itinerant ministers,
||i" i mission is chiefly that of teaching, do not properly
hiii a hierarchy. Their authority is derived directly from
ln Holy Ghost and not from the Church. The *charismata*
« special graces which, unlike sanctifying grace and the
Ills of the Holy Ghost, are accorded to certain of the faith-
ul for the welfare of the whole Church rather than for their
hi-i mal sanctification. Although these graces are of varying
Burees, they are not dependent one upon the other. The
yidache gives them a certain order of dignity which corres-
iinils to that given by Saint Paul. " And God indeed hath
ld some in the Church: first apostles, secondly prophets,
hldrly doctors" (Z. *Cor.*, XII, 28). As a general rule they
[rki not attached to any particular Church: the prophets and
ln doctors, however, may be so attached, but the apostles
■ver.

[The peculiar gift of the apostles seems to have consisted
|i the fact of having seen the Lord and being witnesses to
)|s resurrection². In this they were assimilated to Peter
imi Paul and the Twelve, but they did not share the special
liivileges of these latter, in particular, infallibility. The
iiillifal were warned to be on their guard against false
wophets (ψευδοπροφήτη , XI, 5). The true apostles may be
IIKiwn by the fact that they teach according to tradition, do
ftnt seek their personal gain, and pass rapidly from com-
iliiniity to community in order that the whole Church may
Benefit by their testimony.

I The prophets are not bound so strictly to this life of
kfiivelling missionaries. Should they desire it, they may
lili.u h themselves to a Church. Their office is to speak in
|ln spirit: under God's guidance they speak to men in
η lungue they can understand, exhorting and consoling
Hum, and if need be revealing the mysteries to them. It is

• IKMMER, *loc. lit.*, p. LII-LIX.

Mir Batiffol, *Eludes d'hist. et de thiol, fas.*, r, p. 269.

clear that this gift is not to be confused with the glossolaly (Z *Cor.*, xiv). The prophets as seen in the Didache play an active part in the life of the Church : they are High Priests (ἀρχιερεῖ , XIII), celebrate the Eucharist (XV), and extemporise the Eucharistic thanksgiving (x) : the firstfruits of the community are given to them for their upkeep. It has been thought that at least some among them had received the fulness of the priesthood in addition to the prophetic charisma. This hypothesis, which supposes them to have been *bishops*, true successors of the Apostles and, like them, missionaries, is intriguing and has the merit of settling more difficulties than it raises. It is well adapted to the details given in the Didache. The fact that their inspiration (xi) is examined by the community, is not a sign of their inferiority as compared with the faithful and the elders, but a prudent measure for the purpose of making sure of the supernatural origin of their inspiration.

The doctors have a lesser role; they have the charisma of knowledge, that is to say, they draw their power of teaching from a supernatural source, but their instruction is not accompanied by transports or ecstasies; it consists of learning acquired by their own studies. They were, in fact, professors of religious doctrine, and it would seem that they were also priests (See *Didache*, XIV-XV).

2. The Didache also speaks of a local hierarchy consisting of *episcopi* and *deacons*. The functions of the latter are not described very clearly, but we know of them from other sources; they were charged with preaching and the care of the poor. The offices of the *episcopi* seem to be subordinated to those of the prophets. Like them, they have liturgical offices to fulfil, but these are described only in comparison to those of the prophets (XV). They seem to have been simple priests occupying a lesser place than the prophets if these are considered as bishops. Nevertheless the local hierarchy does not take second place with regard to those who possess the *charismata* only³. No less than the prophets and the doctors, the “*episcopi*” are first chosen as

¹ Michiels, *Did. Apo!*, art. *Evêques*, col. 1768.

² See the following Chapter, p. 58.

³ Those who only consider the inspired character which marks the prophet tend to bring out the features which show the superiority of the local hierarchy (Mgr. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naiss.*, p. 130-131.

ministers of the Eucharistic service (xv), and since they exercise the same functions they must be mild (in order to govern), without personal interest (as true pastors), sincerely tried (to instruct and teach).

Were these *episcopi* simple priests or were they bishops? The *Didache* does not give the answer to this; both are possible. On the other hand, the *episcopi* may also have been prophets. It has been supposed that the Apostles or their successors chose men endowed with supernatural gifts to be the heads of the Churches. This would explain the Interpenetration of functions which appear in certain Chapters

I c). The sacraments which are mentioned in the *Didache* are Baptism, the Eucharist, and, possibly, Penance.

I a). The following details may be mentioned in regard to Baptism:

I i). The *matter* is living water. This quality is to be preferred on the hint of its symbolical meaning, but it is not necessary.

I ii). The *Trinitarian form* is given twice in ch. vn, and the expression, "Baptizate in nomine Domini" (Ch. IX), must be understood in conformity with it.

I iii). Baptism may be *administered* not only by immersion but also by infusion. This latter was reserved to the sick (clinici) at a later date when baptismal piscinas had been constructed in all the churches.

I iv). The *moral catechesis* is the necessary preparation for Baptism. Several authors consider this to be a *ritual address* forming part of the ceremony and which gave place at a later date to the "abrenuntiatio". There seem to be few grounds for this opinion.

I b). Confession. There is a double mention of this:

I i). In ch. IV, *individual confession* made in the assembly. "In the congregation thou shalt confess thy transgressions and thou shalt not fulfil thy prayer with an evil conscience"; 2. In ch. XIV a more *official* character seems to be given to confession.

There is nothing in these two texts which indicates the manner of fulfilling the confession, whether it be general or particular, made to the whole assembly or to the ministers who preside over it. Since it has the effect of taking away sin, it appears to have been sacramental in its nature. Some authors, however, declare it to have been but a religious rite. It should be noted, nevertheless, that in ch. xt, 7 it is said that "every sin shall be remitted" save the sin against the Holy Ghost.

[1] Prat, *Diet. th. cath.*, art. *Evlques*, col. 1663.

•II. Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, col. 777-780.

[2] A. n'Ai.Ès, *L'Edit de Calliste*, p. 22-23.

c). The Eucharist. The *Didache* bears precious witness to the Eucharist. Mention of it is to be found in two places: in chapters IX and X and in chapters XIV-XV.

1. There is no doubt that it is the Eucharist which is spoken of in this *last passagel*. It is stated that the Sunday assembly meets for a true sacrifice (θυσία). It is enough to compare the descriptions of the Christian assemblies given by Malachy (I, II) and Saint Justin (*I Apol*, LXVII). The context also requires this interpretation: The Breaking of the Bread may only be done by the *episcopi* and the deacons, and no one may participate if he has not previously been reconciled with his enemies (*Matth.*, V, 23-24). It is clear; that this may only be applied to the Eucharist.

2. May the same be said of *chapters ix-x*? Opinions are divided. In the eyes of many rationalists these chapters contain no more than the description of a religious repast, from which the idea of the Eucharist has been gradually evolved. Several Catholic critics are also chary of recognising the Eucharist in these texts. They are inclined to regard it as that semi-liturgical repast, known as the agape; which brought the members of the early Christian communities together on the evening of certain days, even when the Eucharist had already been broken and carried away in the morning. This is the view of Mgr. Ladeuze², followed by Dom Cagin, H. Leclercq³ and others. It is hardly necessary to point out on the other hand that those who take the view that it was not the agape, as do Mgr. Batiffol⁴ and a great number of other authors, and even those who take it to be the agape, such as Funk, have applied the beautiful prayers of thanksgiving contained in these chapters to the Eucharist alone. There is a great deal to be said for this. It is very possible that both these passages are referring to the Eucharist, but from different points of view. While in chapter XIV the *Didache* speaks only of the *Sunday assembly* during which the Sacrifice was offered, here we have a *description*, incomplete perhaps but nevertheless

¹ P. Batiffol, *Eucharistie*, p. 57-60; H. Hemmer, *loc. cit.*, p. xliii. Rauschen, however, holds a contrary opinion: *L'Eucharistie et la pénitence*, p. 2.

² P. Ladeuze, *Rev. or. chrit.*, (1902): p. 339-399.

³ H. Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, col. 1780-1792.

⁴ P. Batiffol, *Eucharistie*, p. 60-76. See also G. Barbillé, *Diet, ih.*, art. *Eucharistie*, col. 1126; H. Hemmer, *loc. cit.*, p. xlvii-L; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dognt.*, I, p. 150-151.

the content, of the ceremony itself and the prayers which were recited. The resemblance between these prayers and those in use at the Jewish repasts need not cause surprise, since the Eucharist itself was a repast, and it is feasible that at the beginning, the Church made use of Jewish formularies in adapting them to a new end.

There are noteworthy, if rudimentary, *liturgical elements* in these two chapters. They have no bearing on the question, however, for those who do not admit the Eucharistic interpretation.

I D) The Parousia or the Second Coming. This word, which in its etymological sense means presence, refers to the return of Christ as He comes to judge all mankind and throw them into the eternal kingdom. The *Didache* reminds the Christians of the second coming as a means of increasing their fervour. Nevertheless, in the *Didache*, no more than in the other Apostolic writings, is the Parousia announced as being near at hand. On the contrary, it is the uncertainty of the hour which is given as a reason for increased vigilance. "For ye know not the hour when the Lord cometh" (XVI, i). It may be that the wish was father to the thought, and that the first Christians had the *impression* that the hour was near. There is nothing in the *Didache* which would lead us to believe the contrary.

This constant reference to the second coming serves as confirmation of what has already been said regarding the final age of this composition. Some time later, at the beginning of the second century, this enthusiastic expectation underwent a transformation, and men turned their thoughts to the spiritual presence of Christ, whether in the Eucharist and its hosts, or in the faithful themselves whom He instructs and guides interiorly by grace. This evolution was due to the faith of some and the obstinacy of others, but it owes all to the influence of the Gospel of Saint John, which explains that Christ comes in judgment each day (v. 25). No one has thrown so much light on this new concept of the Second Coming as Saint Ignatius. It is like the soul of all his spiritual teachings.

* M. Fortescue, *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*.

† M. Christus, *Manuel d'histoire des Religions*, 1916, p. 1024.

‡ See p. 71.

CHAPTER IV.

Saint Clement of Rome.

Special bibliography.

Editions: Funk, *Paires Apostolici*, Tübingen, 1901; H. Hemmer, *Les Pères Apostoliques*, II (coll. *Text. Docum.*), Paris, 1909.

Articles and Studies: P. Godet, 5. *Clément*, in the *Diet, théol.*, I col. 48-54; F. Nau, *Clémentine (Apocryphes)* in *Diet, théol.*, col. 201-223.

Besides the *Introduction* to H. Hemmer's edition, see also A. MICHIELS, *L'Origine de l'épiscopat*, p. 187-199, and the article, *Evêques*, in the *Diet. Ap.*, col. 1780-1786. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 146-156; *Etudes*, 1st series, p. 234 sq. F. Prat, *Evêques*, in the *Diet. théol.* A col. 1663, sq. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* I (1st edit.), p. 118-122, I (9th edit.), p. 120 sq. O. Bardenhewer, *Pat.* I, p. 53-66; *Geschichte. M* I, p. 98-113 (very complete bibliography). J. Lebreton. *La Trinités chez Saint Clément de Rome*, in the *Gregorianum*, VI (1925), p. 369-404.

I. THE LIFE AND WORK OF SAINT CLEMENT.

A). According to Saint Irenaeus, Saint Clement was the fourth bishop of Rome (after St. Peter, St. Linus, St. Anacletus; *Adv. Haer.*, 3). Eusebius based his chronology of the Popes on the information supplied by Saint Irenaeus and Hegesippus, his contemporary: Linus, 68-80; Anacletus, 80-92; Clement, 92-101. There are good reasons for accepting these dates, and there is the best historical evidence for the order which is given. In any case it is quite certain that Saint Clement was bishop of Rome.

There is nothing to prove that Saint Clement was Saint Paul's fellow-labourer mentioned in the Epistle to the Philippians (IV, 3), but neither is there anything which disproves it; from the third century this was the belief of the early Christians. It seems fairly certain that he was a disciple of the Apostles in Rome; and if we are to believe Tertullian,

* Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, in, 4-34.

2 According to this opinion it would seem that St. Clement was St. Peter's first successor. St. Epiphanius (*Hair.* XXVII, 6) relates that there was a tradition that Saint Clement retired from the episcopate a first time for the sake of peace, but later became bishop again. There is also a tradition, mentioned by St. Jerome, that Saint Clement was the second successor of St. Peter (*De Vtris illusi.*, 15). Lastly, other more recent traditions make a distinction between Clement and Anacletus and change yet again the order of the Popes. According to H. Hemmer, these are later attempts to reconcile the legend with the historical details.

was ordained by Saint Peter. Little credence can be given to the theory which identifies him with the consul, *Publius Clemens*. The pagans, as well as the early Christian writers, would not have been slow to observe that one of Clement's cousins had been head of the Church at Rome. The likeness of the names is but insufficient proof. As Herthfoot surmises, it is possible that he was a freedman or the son of a freedman of the family of Flavia.

In the general character of his Letter to the Corinthians is an guide, it would appear that Saint Clement came of Jewish stock, for it betrays an intimate knowledge of the Hebrew that could hardly be expected of a convert. If he was a Jew, he was a Greek Jew who had received an excellent literary and even philosophical education. His Letter to the Corinthians is our only source of information regarding his pontificate, but it is enough to reveal his greatness. It shows him to have been a man of authority, practised in Government. Various traits throw light on his moderation and generosity: the discreet allusion to the recent persecution of Clement (C. i), and the prayer for the emperors, "our princes" (C. 60). By the end of the fourth century, as M. Duchesne points out in the *Liber Pontificalis*, there existed a strong tradition that Saint Clement had died a martyr. Unfortunately, the *Acts*, dating from this century, which relate the circumstances of his martyrdom, are untrustworthy. They relate that he was exiled to the Crimea and condemned to be thrown into the sea. This testimony is confirmed only in a negative manner by the absence of a tomb in Rome.

The Letter to the Corinthians, which is the subject of the next chapter, is the only authentic writing of Saint Clement. Many others, however, have been *attributed* to him; they vary greatly in value and were composed at different periods.

Three of these will be examined later (Ch. VII, p. 79-82):

a). The homily known as the Second Letter to the Corinthians.

b). The two *Epistles to Virgins*.

Five *decretal letters* have been ascribed to Clement in various collections of canonical texts and in Migne's Greek Patrology. For a long time they were regarded as genuine, due to the excellent advice which

* I. Nau, *loc. cit.* col. 201 sq.

* *Ibid.* col. 222.

they contain. There is no doubt, however, that they belong to a later period than the Clementine homilies on which they depend. Indeed,] the first, a letter to James, brother of the Lord, is a kind of introduction to these homilies". The second, also to James, concerns the conservation of the Eucharist; the sacred vessels, etc. The third, to the clergy, treats of the duties of priests and clerks. The fourth is concerned with the avoidance of unbelievers, baptism, confirmation and marriage. Lastly, the fifth, to James of Jerusalem, commends the community life of the faithful and the need of relying on tradition for a proper understanding of Holy Scripture'.

The name of Clementines³ is given to a group of writings which purport to relate the history of Saint Clement of Rome; his youthful soul-searching on the subject of human destiny; his conversion by Saint Peter, whose disciple he became; and how, with the help of Saint Peter, he found again the members of his family whom he had lost, his mother, his father and his brothers. This work of imagination had an enormous vogue from the end of the second century. "Saint Clement's travels in the wake of Saint Peter formed an elastic framework into which it was easy to introduce lessons for the Christians, explanations of certain Christian virtues and dogmas, and controversial matter against the gnostics and pagans". This story was made to serve the purpose not only of the Catholics but also of the pagans. Several editions of varying content are still extant, all bearing a strong individual stamp. The more important of these are: a) The Twenty Homilies⁵ (or better, accounts); a patchwork of the legendary life of Saint Clement and the preaching of Saint Peter, particularly the controversy of the latter with Simón Magus, b) The *Recognitions*⁶, which under a different title deal with the same theme, but with a divergence of detail, chiefly in the sermons, quarrels and teaching. The substance of these pseudo-Clementine works may also be found in a similar compilation, existing only in Syriac, and in four abridged accounts, two in Greek⁷ and two in Arabic⁸.

From a doctrinal point of view, the *Homilies* are inferior to the *Recognitions*. The errors found in the *Homilies* consist of various philosophical and gnostic Judæo-Christian theories (syzygies,...) which are used by the author for the purpose of refuting the opponents of Christianity, notably Simon Magus. "Throughout the whole work", remarks F. Nau, "there prevails a great naturalness and simplicity, together with a constant elevation of ideas, which bring the reader under their charm and incline him to overlook the imperfections of this very ancient writing". The ten books of the *Recognitions* are much superior to them, "for the eloquence and rigour displayed in argument, the coherency

* See also P. G. 2, 27-56.

3 F. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 222.

3 O. Baruhnnewer, *Geschichte*, I, 351-363.

4 F. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 201.

5 P. G., 2, 57-468.

6 P. G., I, 1207-1454.

7 *Epitome de gestis S. Petri*, P. G., 2, 469-604.

8 F. Nau, *op. cit.*, 204-210.

» *ibid.*, col. 207-210.

innipolish of the details and the orthodoxy of the theories". The
 [l..... of aeons occupies but little space and the divinity of Christ
 » 'fairly affirmed. Providence and the government of God is well
 lib'mica: the harmonies are so well brought out that Nau is able to
 lumpire their description with that of Bernardin de Saint Pierre.
 Li'ily, there is a refutation of astrology, so widespread in Chaldaea, and
 *m h i source of danger to the Christians themselves. The Tübingen
 hli ol thought it perceived evidences of the first Christians and even
 jin Roman community in these two works'. According to the most
 Niint critics, however, they could hardly have been composed earlier
 li in the third century³*yet it is supposed that they had a common
 •min c dating as far back as the end of the second century. We may
 ili- sure, however, that Saint Clement, who is the central figure in these
 ■n mints, had nothing to do with their composition.

I The list of Clementine apocrypha is completed as follows :

■ η) The *Apocalypse of Peter* (or Clement «) allied to the *Recognitions* ;

I b; Two Ethiopian apocrypha (not yet edited³).

I o) The *Apostolical Constitutions*, which will be discussed later.

II. THE EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

I A) This famous Epistle, composed of 6\$ chapters, has
 Bren known for a long period : it was incomplete, however,
 Ini- chapters 58-63 were missing in the fourth century Codex
 Wli xandrinus, the only known manuscript, until Bryennios
 puldished the entire text after the Jerusalem manuscript
 fji>56), which also contained the *Didache* and the Epistle of
 Dini nabas 6.

Γ Although this letter is written in the name of the Roman
 Community and bears no author's name, the affirmation
 ul Saint Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, about 170, and the
 testimony of Hegesippus and Saint Iraenaëus, leave us in
 110 doubt as to its authenticity. Without quoting it, Saint
 |i'ilycarp imitated it in his Epistle to the Philippians.

F This letter was written during the aftermath of Domitian's
 |n iwcution, which came to an end in 95 or 96. It is clear
 II h refore, that it was composed about 96-98.

I ' *ibid.*, col. 209.

I · Baur's theories (1835) were already questioned in 1844 by SCHLIEMAN.

i WAITZ (*Die pseudo-klemenlinen*, 1904) like Harnack ascribes them to the
 tullide of the fourth century.

Γ ' Edit, and translation, S. Gr Ébaut, in the *Rev. or. chr.*, 1907-1917.

I See S. Gr Ébaut, *Littérature éthiopienne pseudo-clémentine*, in *Rev. or. chr.*,
 Ij>·11-21, p. 395-400.

• In 1894 Doni Morin published a Latin version in the *Analecta Maredsolana* II,
 alm h possibly dates from the second century. Other early versions are extant,
 mi in Syriac, two incomplete in Coptic.

Its purpose was the re-establishment of peace and order in the Church of Corinth. One or two agitators had driven, the people to rise up against their superiors (presbyters) (47, 5-6), several of whom were above reproach, and had removed them from their ministry (44, 6). There does not seem to have been any question of a struggle for power between the itinerant inspired ministers and the local hierarchy.

It is evident from the way in which Saint Dionysius of Corinth spoke of this Epistle at a later date that it was well received and achieved its purpose.

B) Abstract. The Epistle is composed of two parts. The first part (1-38) contains a number of general moral considerations which were meant to prepare the minds of the Corinthians for the advice and the commands which are given to them in the second part (ch. 39-65). **I**

The 1st Part (1-38), after three introductory chapters (greetings of the Church of Rome to that of Corinth; recollection of the former holiness of the Church of Corinth, now brought into bad repute by the jealousy of certain among them) deals with :

1. *The most needful Christian virtues* (4-15): a) *charity* which destroys jealousy (5-6); i) *penance* (7-8); c) *obedience* (9-10); d) *piety* and *hospitality* (11-12); «) *humility*, source of peace and moderation (13-15).

2. *The motives which are the best calculated to promote these virtues* (16-36): «i) The *example* of Jesus and the saints (16-19) i) *the order* and the *harmony* which, through Christ, should be observed in the world (20-23); i) *d'e promises* of a future life (24-30); d) the *divine blessing* of Christ to be obtained in this life (31-36). This part ends with an exhortation to maintain *discipline* which is as necessary as in an *army*, and thus keep to the order God has established (37-38).

The 2nd Part (39-65) is a lesson directly aimed at putting an end to the discord in the Church of Corinth. It contains :

1. *A very important account of the order which God has established in the Church* (39-44) :

It is arrogance and foolishness to go against the will of God, for without God man is nothing (39).

God Himself established in the Church the variety of offices which are foreshadowed in the Old Law; the *highpriests*, the *priests*, the *levites* (deacons) and the *laity* (40).

These ministers of God must be obeyed (41).

God sent Jesus Christ, and He in turn sent the Apostles who provided the first bishops and deacons from among the first converts (firstfruits) (42).

In order to prevent feuds, the Apostles themselves chose these ministers, as Moses chose Aaron, and provided for a succession of bishops and deacons, to be instituted either by the Apostles or other noteworthy men (ελλόγιμοι ἄνδρες), subject to the consent of the Church (συνευδοκία τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πάσῃ). It is a grave fault to remove irreproachable men from the episcopate and worthy priests from their office (43-44).

rule of conduct for the Corinthians (45-58) :

Illicit conduct is disgraceful; they have torn the members of Christ; their divisions are worse than those that Saint Paul condemned

(15-50).

Let them do penance and their sins will be pardoned (51-53).

For the sake of peace the fomenters of discord must go into exile (55) or at least subject themselves to the elders and keep to their (56-58).

I. Conclusion of the whole Epistle (59-65) :

I line Saint Clement does not flinch from using forceful terms to those who disobey (59); but he goes on immediately to compose a beautiful prayer for peace, which rises almost to lyrical heights (59-61). He sums up his letter and the steps he has taken to restore order (62-63), and mentioning expressed great desire for their obedience, he announces the sending of three messengers, the bearers of his letter, who are to report the outcome of the affair at Rome (64-65).

III. THE TEACHING OF THE EPISTLE.

This letter, so remarkable for the abundance and sureness of its teaching, had a great influence, and in Corinth was almost looked upon as inspired. Seventy years later, according to Dionysius of Corinth, it was still read in the churches on Sundays. All the great truths of the Faith are mentioned in passing, in a greater or lesser measure as they concern the purpose of the letter. Valuable information, however, is given on three points: /I) On the hierarchy, /II) on the Roman Primacy, C) on spiritual life.

I A). Ecclesiastical hierarchy The information on this subject is given in the second part of the Epistle, chiefly in chapters 42-44. *Chapter 40* does not describe the degrees of the Christian ministry but those of the Levite ministry, which was a figure of the former. This similitude prepares the ground for a direct exposition of the author's thesis, and although it does not perhaps furnish a conclusive argument in favour of the threefold ecclesiastical order of Bishops, priests and deacons, it does at least enable us to deduce the existence of a true hierarchy of divine institution, in which the *laity* have no part (the remark is Saint Clement's, ch. 40).

The actual institution of this hierarchy is taught with clearness in *chapter 42*. Jesus Christ Himself, to whom God has given all power, charged his Apostles to

† This account is taken from A. Michiels.

establish it, and the Apostles were faithful to their charge. They placed the first converts at the head of the Churches, with the title of *episcopi* and *presbyteri*, and gave them *deacons* to aid them. Moreover, they have provided for a *succession* ¹ in the hierarchy (ch. 43-44) in order to forestall possible difficulties. The Christian ministry deriving from the Apostles is authoritatively transmitted to new *episcopi*, who, however, must be men of good esteem; therefore the local Church is called upon to give its consent (συνευδοκησάση τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ -άση). The newly elected are just as lawful as those who were named the first; consequently the community has not the right to *remove* them, as also it has not the right to give them their authority, which comes from the Apostles and God Himself.

What exactly was the dignity of these *episcopi* — *presbyteri*? This is a vexed question. There is no doubt that the eminent persons (ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες) who, according to ch. 44, v. 3, had the power, like the Apostles, of instituting the heads of local Churches, were really bishops. But it may be asked whether the *presbyteri* or *episcopi* (synonymous terms in the first century), who directed these Christian communities, were bishops or priests. Traditional opinion considers them to have been simple priests. Petau surmises that they were bishops, or at least many of them. At the present day also, several Catholic critics believe that there existed an episcopal body at the head of the Churches, at least at the time of the Apostles. On the whole, the texts, seem to point to the traditional thesis, somewhat amended by recent historical research.

We are particularly attracted by M. Michiels' ² conclusions! To his mind, the first heads of the Christian communities, whom the Apostles appointed above the deacons, were simple priests, indiscriminately called *presbyteri* or *episcopi*. The fulness of the priesthood, however, was communicated to certain chosen disciples who, like themselves, were missionaries and accompanied them on their visits to the Churches such were Titus and Timothy, companions of Saint Paul, as were also the *prophets* of the *Didache* ³. These men are truly bishops and missionaries, the successors of the Apostles.

¹ See Michiels, *Did. Apol.*, art. *Evlques*, col. 1765.

² *Diet. Apoi.*, col. 1748-1785.

³ *Ibid.*, col. 1768.

After a short time they took their place at the head of particular Churches, as the Apostle Saint James had already done at Jerusalem. Such were the bishops who were established at Antioch and Rome by Saint Peter and in Egypt by Saint John *. The latter played the chief part in this development, instituting Episcopal Sees in many towns of Asia Minor in order to confer the advantage of monarchical government on the particular Churches. It was from this time that the local hierarchy consisted of three degrees, and the title of bishop came to be reserved to the one man who was truly a successor of the Apostles. This multiplication of sees knew a more rapid growth in Asia than in Europe. It would seem that there was no bishop at Corinth when Saint Clement addressed his letter to that Church, nor at Philippi at the time of Saint Polycarp's letter.

The ritual character of the office of the *episcopi* is noteworthy. They have to carry out a λειτουργία: present the offerings, that is to say, offer up the Eucharist (such is the sense of the expression προσενεγκόντε τα δώρα). The heads of the community are not therefore "financial administrators, but ministers of the altar. Having been established for the welfare of Christ's flock, ποιμνίω τοῦ Χριστοῦ, they govern it, ὀλιτευόμενοι, and are its pastors "a.

B). The Roman Primacy 3. Saint Clement's Epistle has ever been considered as being a favourable witness to the supreme authority of the Church of Rome.

In the first place, valuable information may be found therein, regarding its *beginnings*, which in a great measure form the *historical foundation* of this authority. Speaking of those who had suffered from jealousy (probably Jewish, in Nero's time), Saint Clement recalled the "good Apostles", Peter and Paul (ch. 5.), those "columns" of the Church (1 *Cor.* ii, 9), who are numbered among those martyrs who have such a good example to the Romans : ἡμεῖς (ch. 6.). This is an obvious allusion to Saint Peter's residence and death at Rome. The author of the letter undoubtedly had the intention of directing attention to these titles of his Church at a time when he felt the need of all its authority. There is no direct teaching of the Primacy of Rome, but

1 *Ibid.*, col. 1769-1771.

A. Michiels, *Origine*, p. 198.

1 II. HEMMER, *loc. cit.*, p. XLV-XLVII.

the whole epistle is an implicit manifestation of it; its epiphany, to borrow the happy expression of Mgr Batiffol¹. The Church of Rome, instead of proffering excuses for its interference in the affairs of another Church, begins by excusing its delay, as though it had neglected a *duty*. It speaks, moreover, authoritatively, which supposes that it had a full realisation of its rights. In ch. 59, it *threatens*: "If there should be certain who will not hearken to the words that God has spoken to them through us, they may be assured that they are in grave sin and in great danger. We are innocent of this sin". Further on (ch. 63), the wish to be obeyed is expressed. "Indeed, you will be for us the source of great joy and happiness if, obedient to the things we have written to you in the Holy Ghost, you desist from the anger which has carried you away, in response to the call to peace and concord that we have made to you in this letter".

If Rome was previously consulted, this first appeal to her intervention is all the more noteworthy inasmuch as Saint John was still living, possibly at Ephesus, which is no great distance from Corinth². Moreover, the mere fact of having been appealed to by Corinth would not have given her the right of speaking and acting with the authority which is shown in the letter. On the other hand, if this action of the Church of Rome was spontaneous, it proves, or at least gives) the impression (Duchesne) that "this Church was already conscious of a superior and exceptional authority, which it never afterwards ceased to claim"³. Lastly, the welcome! that was given to this letter proves that the Corinthians did not think that Rome had exceeded her power: she commanded; she was obeyed, and her letter was put almost on the same level as Holy Scripture. Even certain Protestants have admitted the outstanding import of this document as a testimony to the justness of the Catholic claim, but they exaggerate when they ascribe the right on which this claim is based to a radical change, "the most outstanding accident in the whole evolution of the Church"⁴. This change only exists in regard to a previous state of affairs, which the/ imagine, but which cannot be proved.

¹ P. Batiffol, *VEglise itaissante...*, p. 146.

² L. Duchesne, *Les Eglises séparées* 1896, p. 125.

³ L. Duchesne, *op. cit.* p. 126.

⁴ P. Batiffol, *VEglise naissante...*, p. 155.

1 The Spiritual Life. The firm and precise disciplinary instructions given by Saint Clement are rivalled by the *spiritual moral directions* on which they are based. The latter afford a splendid example of the exhortations that the heads of the Church, the shepherds of souls, should address to those in their charge. The *moral content* is plentiful, but it is always practical and moderate. The greatest Christian virtues which are recalled here, both directly and by contrast with their opposite vices, exist side by side with the two virtues of obedience and humility, upon which Saint Clement dwells with particular insistency. Saint Clement dwells at even greater length on the reasons for virtuous living. Everything is centred on Christ: the expression ἐν Χριστῷ, ἢ ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, is repeated unceasingly. But there is no speculative reasoning; in chapter 16 the suffering Christ is described, and Christ the Priest and Saviour in chapter 36. Purely rational considerations are occasionally called in to lend confirmation to these supernatural examples, the order observable in all creation (20-21), for instance, and the Discipline of the Roman army. The fable of the phoenix, which is employed by Saint Clement to illustrate the Resurrection, is not, perhaps, quite to the point. But the magnificent prayer, so full of Christian feeling, which is considered one of the finest of the liturgical prayers ever composed by the heads of the Church (ch. 59-61), must have had a profound effect on the feelings of the readers of the Epistle and have contributed in a great measure to their persuasion by the author.

CHAPTER V.

Saint Ignatius of Antioch.

Special bibliography.

Editions: (A. 17., 5, Hefele's edition, 1847); X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici*, Tübingen, 1901; A. Leclercq, *Les Pères Apostoliques*, v. II (mil. Text. Docum.), Paris, 1910.

Special articles and studies: G. Bareille, *Did. thiol.*, art. *if. nace*, col. 685-713.—H. de Genouillac, *L'Eglise chrétienne au temps*

de Saint Ignace d'Antioche (dissertation), Paris, 1907.—M. Rackl, *Die Christologie des h. Ignatius*, v. A. Friburg, 1914.—J. Lebreton, *La théologie de la Trinité dans S. Ignace d'A.*, in *Rech. Se. Rei.*, xv (1925), two articles.—Bardenhewer, *Pat.*, I, p. 99-117; *Geschichte*, I, 119-146.—J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I (1st edition), p. 134-146; *Mélanges*, p. 1-19.—P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le cath.*, p. 157-170; *Eludes hist. et théol. posit.*, 2nd series {Eucharistic}, p. 39-50.—A. Michiels, *L'Origine de l'épiscopat*, p. 390-402.—Dom J. Chapman, *Saint Ignace d'Antioche et l'Eglise romaine*, in the Rev. bénéd., XIII (1896).

I. LIFE OF SAINT IGNATIUS'.

Saint Ignatius is one of the most outstanding figures and one of the strongest characters of the Early Church, and even perhaps of the whole history of the Church. Yet he is only known to us by his letters. But in these he is portrayed with such fiery colours that some have even thought his name, Ignatius, derived from *ignis*. He was also called *Theophorus*: Ἰγνάτιο ὁ καὶ θεοφόρο. Legend was not slow in busying itself with this name, and has taken this word in the passive sense (carried by God Θεοφόρο) to mean that Ignatius was the child whom Jesus took in his arms and offered to the Apostles as an example of humility. Another legend explains it in the active sense (he who carries God, Θεοφόρο), relating that after his death, the name of Christ was found graven in golden letters upon his heart (Vincent of Beauvais). There is no doubt that this name must be taken in the active sense, and if it does indeed possess a mystical sense, it is, as Saint Ignatius himself would have said, the spiritual union with Christ; for he thinks of all Christians as Christ-bearers (Eph., IX).

It would hardly seem that he was born into slavery. His great humility moves him to assume this title so that he may distinguish himself from the Apostles {*Rom.*, IV), just as if another place he terms himself *abortivus* {*Rom.*, 8). It has been thought that this contempt of self was due to a conversion fairly late in life. It is probable that he was a *disciple of the Apostles*, not indeed of Saint John but of Saint Peter or Saint Paul. It is impossible to know who made him Bishop of Antioch. Saint John Chrysostom in his eulogy says it was Saint Peter, while the *Apostolic Constitutions* declare it was Saint Paul, his predecessor, *Evodius*, having been appointed by Saint Peter. Although we have not

' G. Bareille, *Diet. th. cath.*, col. 685-690.

Without knowledge, we can give credence to Eusebius, who has the beginning of his episcopate about 69 and makes it last until the second century.

The circumstances of his martyrdom are just as obscure. In spite of the fact that they exist in five different forms. Only two of these are original. The first or Roman one (*Martyrium Romanum*) is really too far-fetched to merit credence, but the other, that of *Antioch* (*martyrium colbertinum*), although greatly interpolated, has much that is authentic. It errs when it says that Trajan came to Antioch in 107, but it is still possible that the Saint died on this date.

Neither do we know anything of the persecution of which he was the illustrious and perhaps the only victim. All that is known, is that he was *condemned to the beasts*, and that he went to *Rome*, where he was to suffer, under the guard of ten soldiers (ten leopards, *Rom.*, V, 1). This journey was accomplished partly by sea (probably from Seleucia, the port of Antioch, to one of the Cilician or Pamphilian ports), and partly by land across Asia Minor. He passed through Philadelphia of Lydia (north of the Meander: Ala-Chehir) and stopped for some time at *Smyrna*, where he was the guest of Saint Polycarp. From the congregations of Ephesus, Magnesia and Tralles, deputations came to comfort him, accompanied by their bishops, and each of them returned bringing a letter from the martyr to their communities. While at Smyrna he also wrote to the Romans on 24 August (*Rom.*, X, 3), begging them to do nothing to deprive him of the opportunity of martyrdom. From *Troas*, where he learned that the persecution of his Church at Antioch had come to an end, he wrote to the Philadelphians, whom he had seen on his journey, and also to the congregation of Smyrna and to Polycarp. His journey then lay overland through Macedonia, where he followed the Egnatian way as far as Dyrrachium (Durazzo) through Philippi and Thessalonica. The *Philippians* welcomed him with the utmost reverence and wrote a letter to the Christians of Antioch, which they sent by way of Saint Polycarp, to whom also they expressed their desire of seeing any of Saint Ignatius' letters that he might possess. This gave rise to Saint Polycarp's letter to the Philippians.

The Bishop of Antioch suffered at Rome, probably in the Amphitheatre (Colosseum) the death he had so desired. If we can place any trust in the *martyrium colbertinum* he must have arrived in Rome towards the end of the games, given by Trajan on the completion of his Dacian expedition, and which occupied the whole of the year 107. In these spectacles ten thousand gladiators perished, and, after all the prisoners had been thrown to them, eleven thousand wild beasts were slaughtered. It was thus that Saint Ignatius perished, becoming, as he had often wished, "the wheat of Christ... ground by the teeth of beasts". The earliest witnesses relate that only the hardest bones of his body remained. They were gathered up by the Christians and taken back to Antioch, where they immediately became the object of pious veneration.

II. THE WORKS OF SAINT IGNATIUS.

A). The only authentic writings of Saint Ignatius are the seven letters mentioned in the Life and addressed to the Christians of 1. Ephesus; 2. Magnesia; 3. Tralles; 4. Rome; 5. Philadelphia; 6. Smyrna; 7. to Saint Polycarp. The evidence in favour of this collection is found in the letter of Saint Polycarp to the Philippians, and particularly in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, who, after having consulted earlier documents, gives the contents of these letters in the same order as that mentioned above. During the fourth century, however, these letters were interpolated by an Arian or an Apollinarist writer, who also compiled six entirely spurious letters purporting to be from Saint Ignatius. These were the letters to the Philippians, to the Antiochenes, to the Tarsians, to Hero, a deacon of Antioch and to Mary of Cassobola. There was also a letter to Saint Ignatius attributed to the last-named.

The seven interpolated letters and the six entirely spurious ones were for a long period the only texts attributed to Saint Ignatius. A consequence of this was that very grave doubts were entertained as to their authenticity. It was not until the seventeenth century that Archbishop Ussher, of Ireland, discovered the primitive text of six of Ignatius' letters, while Dom Ruinart, some years later, published the text of the Letter to the Romans which Ussher had rejected. These discoveries

* G. Baccii, *ibid.*, 689-690, and 711-712.

' *Hist. Eccl.*, nt, 36; P. G., 36, 282.

la storm of controversy both in the Catholic and the Protestant
 Then, in the nineteenth century, Cureton published a special
 lull, lion containing the Syriac version of three of these letters. This
 mil- non is called the abridged or *short recension* so that it may be
 di i r;uished from the two preceding ones, called respectively the
 md the *mixed recension*. This publication gave new life to the
 pillil mtrovery and intensified the opposition offered to the mixed
 mvih ion. In 1885, however, Lightfoot * definitely established the
 ■lilirnticity of the latter and since then there remain few critics, even
 ■liong the rationalists, who do not admit the force of his conclusions.
 Rio other position is untenable, for it would be illogical to suppose
 limi arguments drawn from mere internal criticism could weaken or
 liotion the explicit witness of Eusebius and Saint Polycarp, corroborated
 ■y Saint Ignatius' and Origen's quotations '. This is all the more
 ■viiil-nt if it is considered that these arguments reek of religious
 ■lipidice and often enough are based on false premisses, such, for
 Kitanice, as the assertion that a monarchical episcopate did not exist at
 ■ll beginning of the second century³.

■ ll: These Epistles are remarkable for the *similarity of their contents*.

■ l The first three (to the *Ephesians*, the *Muḡnesians* and the
9'r.dlians) are developed on parallel lines. Thus, in the *first part*,
 Suini Ignatius, after having thanked his correspondents for having sent
 ■ deputation to him, exhorts them to remain loyal to their bishops,
 ■hili' in the *second part* he warns them vigorously against the heretics
 Kind their agents.

■ ll In the Letter to the Philadelphians he offers advice concerning
 Blr resistance to be made to a group of dissidents, perhaps heretics,
 Min, since Saint Ignatius' visit to that town, had not ceased to trouble
 lit unity and the peace of their Church.

■ ll In the Letter to the Christians of Smyrna he insists parti-
 ililailly on Docetism, which was a special source of peril for them, and
 ■le h is them to stand fast by their bishop. This advice finds its
 ■hinterpart in the letter to Polycarp, full of good counsel regarding
 lini duties of the pastor of the flock, and written in Apostolic style.
 Riuni Ignatius' age, his dignity, his approaching martyrdom and perhaps
 llu- < \pressed desire of Polycarp, all justified him in writing in such
 I tv \ to the young bishop of Smyrna.

■ li The Letter to the Romans differs from the others inasmuch as
 B lirais with another subject. Here there is no question of heresy or
 lln uihy. It owes its great value to the vivid portrait of a Christian
 ■ml, a soul which perhaps has never had its equal for the fineness of
 li liflings, its contempt of death and its desire of heaven. Throughout
 Hit whole letter runs the strong current of a profound *spiritual and*

* ... *Ignatius*, t. I, p. 273-314.

' ' A. Lblong's refutation of these arguments, *loc. cit.*, p. xvn-xxxr, and
 to II. Jiareii.i.E, *loc. cit.*, col. 697-702.

lll i authentic letters are to be found in *P. G.* 5, (Hefele's ed.J, p. 643-728,
 lu, i ii's short collection, 961-968, the interpolated letters, 729-872 and the
 ll... ns letters, 873-948.

mystical life, not only that of one man but also of an entire period, the period of the martyrs.

C). Saint Ignatius' style ' is far from classical. But we must disregard the grammarians and overlook the frequent redundancy, the violent and obscure metaphors, the badly turned and often unfinished periods. All that, fades and disappears behind the ideas that the author develops. As a rule these stand out sharp and clear, with a clarity which is intensified by the unexpectedness and even strangeness of his expressions. The force of will and the intensity of feeling which mark the man, appear in his style and give to it an impelling rhythm. In certain parts of his letters, above all in his Letter to the Romans, he attains to the summit of eloquence; even Renan had to admit that it was "one of the jewels of primitive Christian literature".

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT IGNATIUS' EPISTLES.

The usefulness of these epistles consists above all in the precision of the details which they give regarding:

1. Ecclesiastical hierarchy.
2. Privileges of the Roman Church.
3. Christ, and the heretics who deny Him.
4. Spiritual life.

A) The hierarchical constitution of the Church is particularly revealed in the letters of Saint Ignatius to the Eastern Churches. Saint Ignatius was acquainted with a *hierarchy* consisting of three distinct degrees : bishops, priests, and deacons ; each Church possessed but one bishop. Only an Apostolical and divine origin can explain the existence of such a hierarchy, and a monarchical episcopate at the beginning of the second century. Fifty years are not enough to explain the spontaneous evolution of such an organisation, as even the rationalists, who persisted for so long in denying the authenticity of Saint Ignatius' letters for this very reason, are now obliged to admit. But Saint Ignatius, unlike Saint Clement, is not interested in the origin of these functions. Like the true mystic that he is, he gives his attention to the superior authority which works in them. " The bishop is in the place of God; the priests are the senate of the Apostles, and the deacons are the ministers of Jesus Christ " (*Magn.* vi). Therefore, the faithful must submit themselves to the bishops as to Jesus Christ Himself

to the order of the priests as they would to the Apostles (7r«ZZ. II, I, 2) ».

The bishop holds a radical place in his Church, of which he is, as it were, the embodiment. Saint Ignatius never says that he may not act independently of his presbyterium or of his congregation. At each page he repeats that the priests must ever remain subject to him, like the strings to the lyre (1-ph. IV, 1); their duty is to encourage, to give heart (ἀναψύκειν) to the bishop (Trail, xil)2. The deacons, who are always placed in the third place, are inferior to the priests and are subject to them, as Saint Ignatius especially points out to the deacon, Zotion, in the letter to the Magnesians. The duties of *faithful* may also be reduced to the principal obligation of remaining united to the hierarchy, and especially to the bishop3, by a common faith and obedience, in brief, nothing must be done without the bishop (Magn. IV; Philad. VII, 2). Even the administration of the sacraments is subject to his authority; it is forbidden to baptise without the bishop (Smyrn. Vili), nor may the Eucharist be celebrated without his permission (*ibid.*). Marriages also must receive his approval (Polyc. V, 2).

The letter to Saint Polycarp, which is nothing more than a pastoral treatise, is but a confirmation of these details regarding the rights of the bishop, but it also insists on the corresponding duties. Saint Ignatius declares: 1. That the bishop must watch over both *spiritual* and *temporal* things, and that he must allow nothing to be done without his permission; 2. that he must stand fast before the onslaughts of heretics, "like the anvil under the hammer" (ill, 1); he should be mild, calming the violent with soothing words (li, i), yet he must not apply the same salve to all wounds (ii, 1); 4. lastly, he must allow no one to be overlooked, he must take heed of all, widows, slaves, husbands and wives (iv, v).

11). The apologists of the privileges of the Church of Antioch rightly have recourse to Saint Ignatius. His testimony is extremely useful, but it can only be appreciated in full extent after careful examination.

1. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le cath.*, p. 158. See also A. Michiels, *Épiscopat*, p. 390-402.

2. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogal.*, t. I (1st edit.), p. 140-141; (9th edit.), p. 131 sq.

3. (9th edit.), p. 139-140.

In the first place it should be observed that Saint Ignatius is the first to have employed the expression, Catholic Church, an expression which was to have such a glorious future: "Wheresoever the bishop shall appear, there let the people be, even as where Jesus is, there is the Catholic (universal) Church (Swyr. vili, 2) "1. Saint Ignatius has thus perceived a greater unity which contains in itself all the individual Churches. The word "Catholic" which he employs was used as meaning "universal" by the profane authors; and Ignatius keeps to this meaning. In the Acts of the martyrdom of Saint Polycarp this word is already employed with a derived and more technical sense as signifying, when applied to a particular Church, that it is the true Church and as such, distinct from the heterodox sects. This aspect of the word does not seem to be intended by Saint Ignatius. Nevertheless, in using this expression he directly intends the mystical union of all the faithful in Christ, by Faith and Charity 3. This common union in Christ, however, does not exclude a more visible and tangible union. Thus, in the Letter to the Romans, he begs their prayers for the Church of Syria, which in the absence of its bishop is governed (ἐπιχοπεῖ) by Christ, and the charity of the Romans (ἀγάπη).

The Church of Rome occupied and was conscious of her high position. This is already insinuated by the unequalled! praise which is given to her alone, by the first Western bishop, the second successor of Saint Peter in the See of Antioch. Two of the expressions contained in this eulogy! should be especially noted: (*Ecclesia*) *quæ præsidet in loco; regionis Romanorum* (ἡτ'. χαί προκάθεται, ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ρωμαίων), and particularly (*Ecclesia*) *digne-casta et caritatis præsidens* (ἀξιόαγνο καὶ προκαθήμενη τῇ ἀγάπῃ). The verb προκάθηναι, Funk observes, has never the meaning "to be distinct from" or "to be noteworthy", but signifies the exercise of a true supremacy, and, according to Saint Ignatius 4, a supremacy of authority such as is possessed by the bishops and the presbyterium in their congregations (*Magn.*, VI, i, 2). Moreover, this verb may be used with or without an objective complement s. In the first of the above

1 "Οπου ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ Ἐκκλησία.

2 See P. Batiffol, *L'Egl. naiss.*, p. 166 (note 3).

3 H. de Genouillac, *loc. cit.*, p. 108-109.

* *ibid.*, p. 237.

• Funk, see Batiffol, *loc. cit.*, p. 168.

expressions there is no complement and the adverbial phrase ὁπῶς χωρὶς τῶν Ῥωμαίων, does not limit the supremacy, but duly points out the place in which it is exercised, the word ἰ.ε., / being understood. In the second of these expressions, Ἡρ complement ἀγάπη, is not determined in its extension ἡ κλ must signify a universal collectivity. Saint Ignatius, in four occasions, employs ἀγάπη for ἐκκλησία as meaning the local Church², but since Saint Ignatius possesses the notion of a universal Church (καθολική) there is no reason to believe that the collectivity of which he speaks here, is not the whole Church. In any case, it is not the bishop but the Church of Rome which is spoken of in this place, and she obviously can only preside over others than herself.

■ Of what kind of primacy is Saint Ignatius speaking? Does he only refer to a primacy of honour? There are some Catholics, even Catholics, who take this view. But it should be considered that besides the word προκάθημαι, by which Ignatius sometimes means the exercise of true authority, Saint Ignatius is also alive to the fact that it was the Church of Rome which heard the preaching of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and which has instructed and given orders to the other Churches³. Whether it is Saint Clement writing with authority to Corinth, or some other incidents that Ignatius has in mind, matters little; he knows of these things and he approves of them. He gave advice to all the Churches which he visited on his way to Rome, but to Rome herself he proffered no counsel. All this can only be explained on the supposition that Rome possessed efficacious authority, although Saint Ignatius' letter is vague enough, regarding the way this authority is exercised, the principle stands out clearly enough. In this it is consonant with its period, the middle which lies between the letter of Saint Clement and the testimony of Saint Irenaeus.

It) Christ is the central point of all the ideas of Saint Ignatius and pervades all his teaching on the Church. Yet when he speaks of the opposition to be offered to the new born heresies, that he speaks of the Church. This is logical, however, for it is his intense love of Christ which led him to depict the *innovators* in the darkest colours.

* A - TM., IX, 3; *Trail.*, XIII, I; *Phil.*, XI, 2; *Smyrn.*, xti, 1.

• II. UK GENOUII.1.AC, *loc. cit.*, p. 238.

* I. Duchesne, *Eglises sifaries*, p. 127-129.

With energy and vividness of style, he terms the enemies of the true faith, ferocious beasts (Eph. vn), ravening wolves (Phil. II, 2), mad dogs, inflicting cowardly bites (Eph. VII, 1), animals with human faces (Smyrn. IV, 1), tombs and the columns of sepulchres (Philad. vi), weeds of the devil (Eph. X, 3), parasitical plants that have not been set by the Father (Trail. Xi), and meet for eternal fire (Eph. XVI, 2). False doctrines are the stench of the devil (Eph. xvn, 1).

Saint Ignatius combats two kinds of heretics : the Judaizers and the Docetists. The *Judaizers* teach that it is necessary to observe certain points of the Mosaic Law in order to be saved : the Magnesians (vin, IX, x) and the Philadelphians (v, vi) especially are warned against them. The Docetists taught that the humanity of Christ was but an illusion, having no objective reality : consequently His life was a mere phantasm and the Eucharist is not the Body of Christ. Saint Ignatius seizes every opportunity of refuting these errors, but more especially in his letter to the Christians of Smyrna. It is possible that at the time of which we speak these two heresies formed but two aspects of one and the same error, "*Judæo-gnosticism*". The holy martyr endeavoured to destroy the effect of their propaganda! by enjoining strict obedience on the faithful and exhorting them always to work in concert with the hierarchy. Especially does he insist on loyalty to the bishop, without whom nothing may be done (Phil, vn, 2; Magn. iv).

The most important doctrinal point which was brought to light in this struggle with the Docetists is the Incarnation of the Word. Saint Ignatius' faith in the Divinity of Christ and the reality of His human nature cannot be placed in doubt, although the relations which Christ bears to the Father, were not always as clearly explained as they might have been. Thus, the expressions, *genitus et ingenus*, or again, *filius Dei secundum voluntatem et potentiam Dei* need further explanation⁴.

In the course of this controversy against Docetism, Saint Ignatius is brought to affirm, not only the reality of Christ's

* H. de Genouillac, *loc. cit.*, p. 240, sq.; A. Lelong, *loc. cit.*, p. xxm xxviii; and J. Texeront, *Mélanges*, p. 8-9.

³ Eph. vn, 2.

³ Smyrn, I, i.

•See G. Bareille, *op. cit.*, col. 703-706; Rackl, *op. cit.* J. Lebreton deals with the whole of the Trinitarian doctrine in the above mentioned article!

human nature but also the reality of the Eucharistic Body. On this point his teaching is not consistently clear. Mr. Batiffol¹ points out the passages where the Eucharist is certainly in question (Smyrn. vii, 1-2; Eph. XX, 2; Phil. iv). The texts in which ἀγάπη means a repast always refer to the Eucharist². In many other texts, however, the Saint's meaning is more obscure. This is especially so in Smyrn. vii, 1, and Rom. vii, 3, where the author uses the mystical sense and considers the Eucharist as a symbol of Christian unity. But, as Mgr. Batiffol³ remarks, the symbolical sense does not exclude the reality in a literal sense; on the contrary, it supposes it, and derives its force from the fact that the Body of Christ is really contained in the Eucharist.

I 11). The spiritual life of Saint Ignatius, no less than his teaching on the Church, is imbued throughout by the thought of the presence of Our Lord. This is evident in many passages of his epistles, but more particularly in his Epistle to the Romans. The predominant theme is the *presence of Christ* in the faithful, even as He is present in His Church. The generation of which Saint Ignatius is the most illustrious member, gave less thought to the imminence of the *Second Coming* than to the mystical and spiritual presence of the Saviours. This gave rise to a number of thought-provoking expressions. "Let us perform all our actions with the thought that God is present within us: and then we shall be His temples, and He will be God dwelling within us" (Eph. xv, 3). It is with the same idea in mind that he calls Christians, *God-bearers, temple-bearers, Christ-bearers, saint-bearers* (Eph. ix), and reiterates his second theme of Theophorus at the beginning of all his epistles, (God reveals His presence to those whom he loves (Eph. xv): His presence is the result of *faith* and *charity*, for "faith and charity are the beginning and the end of life; faith is the beginning, charity the consummation, and the union of both in God Himself" (Eph. xiv) 5.

¹ Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de thiol. pos.*, 2nd series (*Eucharistie*), t. I., 1920, p. 39-44.

² Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de thiol. posit.*, 1st series, 6th ed., 1920, t. I., p. 298.

³ *Ibid.*, 2nd series, p. 44-50.

⁴ Si... *Christus, manuel d'hist. des relig.*, Paris, 1916, p. 1022-25, 1031.

⁵ Si. J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 15.

Saint Ignatius was so penetrated by the presence of Our Lord that his body became irksome to him, for it hindered him from giving himself entirely to his Saviour. He longed for death; to be crushed, to become the wheat of Christ. Echoing Saint Paul, he says: "For to me to live is Christ and to die is gain" (Phil., I, 21). "In the unity of a single vigorous phrase, Ignatius combines the idea of death and going to Christ" * in the Letter to the Romans (vi) ἀποθανεῖν εἰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. This admirable letter is wholly pervader! with Saint Ignatius' aspirations to another life. *Death* undergoes a transformation; after death he will no longer be a simple voice (φωνή), but will have become a word (λόγος) by union with the Word (Il); again, to die is to sink from the sight of the world and to rise again in God (il). Death is the attainment of Christ (V), a re-birth in a new life (v), entrance into the pure light (vi), an assimilation to Christ Himself, even as in this world we are assimilated to Him when we eat of His Flesh and drink of His Blood (vil, 3). Considered from this point of view, even *suffering* becomes a thing to be desired. The blood which is shed, is a libation offered on the altar of sacrifice (n). To be devoured by the beasts is to become wheat, milled for God even as Christ was crushed to become our spiritual bread (iv). Even the cruellest torments are tempered and sweetened; fire, cross, combats with beasts, mutilation of limbs, dislocation of bones, the crushing of the whole body (v). To suffer thus, is to imitate the passion of one's God (vi). Because the saint crucified his worldly passions during life, a voice within him murmurs "Come thou to the Father" (vii).

These noble aspirations are accompanied by a twofold disposition. The first is a great contempt of self, which he experiences very forcibly. Compared to the Apostles, he is not only a slave (iv) but also an abortion, unfit to be counted among the members of Christ (ix). Similar expressions may be found in the Epistle to the Trallians (IV, V). Nevertheless, Saint Ignatius was by no means pusillanimous, in spite of his lively desire of heaven and the consciousness of his littleness. His letters, on the contrary, reveal him as a man of *unremitting zeal and activity*; all of them, especially those addressed to the Eastern Churches, are filled with astonishingly forceful admonitions and fruitful advice.

1 *Christus, toe. cit.*, p. 1032.

coherence and unity are given to these apparently contradictory dispositions by his profound knowledge of Christ in which they are rooted. This knowledge of Christ, not only as Man but also as God, was so intimate, so vital, that it approached the beatific *vision*. Such was the knowledge of the mystics of a later date called *contemplation* '. But Saint Ignatius, unlike Saint Clement of Alexandria and Saint Augustine, did not occupy himself with its theoretical aspects. But he did more; he experienced and savoured this knowledge and attained the perfect consummation of the perfect Christian life.

CHAPTER VI.

Saint Polycarp. The Presbyters. Papias.

1. SAINT POLYCARP'. EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS. ACTS OF HIS MARTYRDOM.

I. Epistle to the Philippians. This Epistle is Saint Polycarp's answer to the letter which the Philippians had addressed to him after Saint Ignatius had passed through their town. The Bishop of Smyrna informs them that he will see to the forwarding of their letter to Antioch, and that he is sending them the collection of Saint Ignatius' letters for which they had asked (XII). In addition he gives them, as they had desired, a moral exhortation.

This letter is not couched in that powerful and novel style which is a feature of Saint Ignatius' letters. Written in a style which is simple and almost dull, it consists for the most part of extracts from the New Testament, especially Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, and also passages from the Epistle of Saint Clement of Rome. It is noteworthy, not for its theological interest which is but slight, but for its evidence regarding the works of Saint Ignatius.

' Ignatius calls it *θεοῦ γνώσι* and distinguishes it from *θεοῦ γνώμη*, which is practical rather than theoretical knowledge, "the sense of God", as LEBRETON says, *op. cit.*, p. 413-414.

Editions : The same as for Saint Ignatius. Studies : Principally A. LONG's *introduction* in the collection *Text. Docum.*

The fact that there is no mention of bishops in this letter is a confirmation rather than an objection against its authenticity. Had it been a forgery, compiled for the purpose of bolstering up a spurious Ignatian letter, it would certainly have contained references to the hierarchy and its privileges. There is perhaps no other early writing, observes A. Lelong, which possesses better guarantees of authenticity. Internal criticism has been unable to raise any serious difficulties.

2. Life of Saint Polycarp. Apart from the information that can be gleaned from the letters of Saint Ignatius and the Letter to the Philippians, some few incidents of Saint Polycarp's life are reported by Saint Irenaeus who, having been his disciple about the year 140, had listened to his instructions, taken note of his teaching and recorded it faithfully. He particularly insists on his love for tradition. Saint Polycarp was the last survivor of the Apostolic age. He had been personally acquainted with Saint John, and had been made a bishop by the Apostles, according to Irenaeus, more specifically by Saint John, according to Tertullian. Towards the end of his life he was consequently treated with great veneration. "Numerous disciples gathered around him to hear from his lips the last living echo of Apostolic teaching". We possess no letters written by him at this date.

About the year 155, during the pontificate of Saint Anacleto (155-166) he came to Rome to confer with him concerning the celebration of Easter. The two pontiffs were unable to agree, but nevertheless separated without friction. It was at Rome that Saint Polycarp made his famous answer to Marcion: "I recognise thee as the first-born of Satan" 1

He was martyred a short time after his return from Rome, about the year 155-156. This is the date given by Waddington, who has fixed the date of the consulate of Stadius Quadratus under whom he died. The Acts of his martyrdom give his age as eighty-six. The year of his birth was approximately the year 70, and he was made bishop before he was forty (before 110).

3. The Acts of the martyrdom of Saint Polycarp. These Acts relate the circumstances of his death with a

¹ Iren., *Adv. Haer.*, III. in, 4; *P. G.*, 7, 853.

p" at wealth of detail. They consist of a letter, written a year following his death, by a certain Marcion, in the name of the Church of Smyrna and addressed to the Church of Philomelium (Ek-Sheher) and to "all the Christian congregations of the world belonging to the Catholic Church". On Saturday, February 23, Saint Polycarp was burned alive in the Stadium of Smyrna, or more exactly, since the flames had no effect, he was killed by a dagger thrust and his body left to be consumed by the flames. The Christians gathered up his ashes and placed them in a decent place, where at a later date they were accustomed to come on the occasion of his anniversary.

Hardly any doubts are entertained regarding the authenticity of this important and "transparently sincere" document.

11. THE PRESBYTERS.

The Presbyters or Elders mentioned in ecclesiastical literature, are men who lived between the years 70 and 150 and who had spoken with the Apostles or their immediate disciples. The early authors have reproduced some of their teaching in the form of *short sayings*, which had been safeguarded by *oral transmission*, even in the cases of Elders who had written themselves, such as Aristion. Saint Polycarp also is sometimes given this title.

The best known of these witnesses of the second generation is the *Asiatic Elders* to whom Saint Irenaeus refers in his *Adversus haereses* 2 while on the subject of Eschatology 3. He relates several sayings or teachings, which he supposes them to have had from the Apostles, and Saint John in particular. This is a general testimony of undoubted value in favour of Saint John's residence in Asia. But on the other hand the trustworthiness of these sayings is less sure. Saint Irenaeus seems to be acquainted with them only through the writings of Papias, while Papias admits that the essence of this testimony of the Elders, is the gossip of those who came to see him at Hierapolis and whom he questioned avidly. He listened to everything he was told, in the most

1. Sec F. Vernet. *Saint trinite* in the *Diet, tktol.*, col. 2512; M. J. Lagrange, *agile selon Saint Jean*, Paris, 1925 (p. xxix sq.); W. S. Reilly, *Les presbyteres asiates dans saint Irénée*, Revue Biologique, 1919, p. 216.
 2. *Adv. Haer.* V, 5, 30, 33, 36.

These fragments are in Funk, *Patres apostolici*, i. 378-389.

credulous fashion, even believing that Christ lived for more than fifty years and that His kingdom on this earth was to last exactly a thousand. But did not Papias know Saint John and did he not listen to his teaching? The whole authority of Papias depends on this question, which has not yet received a satisfactory answer.

III. PAPIAS I.

Saint Irenaeus held Papias in great esteem. After having mentioned the elders who had seen John, the disciple of the Lord, he adds: "That has also been related in writing by Papias, a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, a man of old time²". Saint Irenaeus does not doubt that Papias had been a disciple of the Apostle Saint John. We cannot be sure, however, whether Saint Irenaeus was personally acquainted with Papias, or knew him only by his books. If the latter is the case, then his authority is lessened as far as Papias is concerned, while his extraordinary credulity becomes easier of explanation, for after all, the source of his information was a very early writing, composed by a bishop living in the very regions where John had preached.

Eusebius is in agreement with Saint Irenaeus in his *Chronicle* (the year 2122 of Abraham), but adopts another opinion in his *Ecclesiastical History*, which he bases upon the opening words of the work of Papias; he asserts that the Bishop of Hierapolis was not the disciple of Saint John the Evangelist, but of the *presbyter John*. It might be thought that such an opinion might cast a doubt on the authenticity of the fourth Gospel and on the Apostle's residence in Asia. But Fr. Lagrange says that this presents no real difficulty, since there is no need to exaggerate the importance of presbyter John, who is never mentioned again by Papias. The phrase bears a perfectly natural meaning and offers no obscurity. Other authors, however, think that the text of Papias is certainly confusing, and that Eusebius was prejudiced against him. They prefer to adopt Saint Irenaeus' assertion that Papias was the hearer and the disciple of the Apostle Saint John.

¹ Funk, *Patres apost.*, I, 346 sq.; M. J. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, *ibid.*; F. Vernet, *op. cit.*; J. Chapman, *Revue Bénédict.* 1905 (t. XXII).

² *Adv. Haer.*, V, 33, 4; *P. G.*, 7, 1214.

There is no doubt, however, that Papias had spoken with the immediate disciples of the Apostles and belonged to the Christian generation. He became Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia and composed an "*Explanation of the Oracles of the Lord*" in five books about the year 125 (λογίων κυριαχῶν

This work purported to interpret, not only the oracles of the Lord but also the narratives of Our Lord's actions, and run the marvellous stories which the author had heard by way of oral tradition. To the words of Christ he adds "other elements which, he says, came to him by oral tradition; such as certain strange parables and teachings of the Lord, as well as other altogether fabulous accounts".

Eusebius reproaches him with having been the first to teach the chiliastic view and by so doing to have led many other ecclesiastical writers into error. "Among other things he says there will be a thousand years after the resurrection of the dead, and that Christ will reign in a material kingdom upon the earth. It would seem that these notions are due to his misunderstanding the writings of the Apostles, since he did not sufficiently understand their use of symbolical expression and figures of speech. If we may judge by his writings, he was a man of but mediocre talent. It was through him, moreover, that a great number of ecclesiastical writers fell into the same error, for they placed their trust in the ancientness of his writing. It was thus that Saint Irenaeus adopted his opinion".

At the end of this chapter Eusebius gives an account of the two celebrated passages of Papias concerning *Mark* and *Matthew*, and adds that "Papias published a story of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*".

These fragments, collected by Eusebius, together with a few others quoted by Apollinarius, are all that remain of the work of Papias.

Accordingly as they regard Papias as the disciple of Saint John the Apostle, or of John the presbyter, the critics fix the date of his death at about 120-30 (Zahn, Bardenhewer) or about 140-60 (Harnack, Batiffol).

¹ Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, in, 39, n. 8, 9, 10, 11.
Ibid., 12, 13.

CHAPTER VII.

Various Pseudepigraphal Writings.

Bibliography : See the list given for each author.

I. THE EPISTLE ATTRIBUTED TO SAINT BARNABAS.

The writing consisting of twenty-one chapters and known as the Epistle of Saint Barnabas is a homily or short apologetical treatise in letter form. It was composed for those Christians who were in danger of being seduced by the Jewish or Judaizing propaganda, which taught that the Law was necessary for salvation. As an offset against this tendency, the author employs the greater part of his work in giving a purely *spiritual interpretation* of the Old Testament. The figure of Christ the Redeemer stands out clearly (ch. V. sq.) : it was He who was announced by all the prophets, and foreshadowed in the legal prescriptions. The author, carried away by his enthusiasm for the spiritual sense, upbraids the Jews with not having taken all the narrative and incident of the Old Testament in an allegorical and mystical sense. God did not ask for bloody sacrifices, but for a contrite heart; not for bodily fasting, but for good works; not the circumcision of the flesh, but that of the ears and the heart; not abstinence from certain meats, but the avoidance of the vices figured by impure animals². In the last chapters (xviii-xxi) he gives a *moral* instruction known by the name of the *Two Ways*, and modelled on that of the *Didache*. He concludes with a mention of the *Parousia*.

Christian Antiquity (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Saint Jerome) attributed this work to Saint Barnabas, the companion of Saint Paul, but did not place it among the inspired writings. The real Barnabas must have

¹ Editions : Funk, *Patres apostolici*, 1901 ; G. Oger and A. Laurent, *Les Pires Apostoliques* (Coll., *Text, et Docum.*), Paris, 1907.

Studies: G. Bareille, *Barnabae Ep. de s.* in the *Diet. thiol.*, col. 416-422; G. Oger, in the above edition, *introduction*, p. lxi-lxxxvii; P. Ladbuzb, *Eplre de Barnabi*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1900.

² The author announces the principle of this allegorical interpretation in chapter iv. " Let us become spiritual; let us become a *perfect* temple for God" (11). He comes track again to this subject in chapter X,vi, before concluding the first part: the Christian is the true temple of God

li ni too great a respect for the Old Testament ever to have hiippedressed the literal sense entirely, by making such an i iggerated use of allegory in order to bring out its spiritual use. If the author was really a disciple of Saint Paul, he li.is perverted the teaching of his master. It is probable that Im wrote at *Alexandria*, the home of allegory. The earliest li i timony we possess, points to this town. The latter part ul ihe Epistle shows that *he used the Didache* (The existence nl a still earlier document, the common source of both the Jfidache and this Epistle, is too nebulous a problem to be worth discussion).

The date of composition is very uncertain. Two dates ini rit consideration : the reign of *Nerva* (96-98) and the nion of *Hadrian* (117-138), before the Jewish rebellion |f 132*.

i More recently, M. d'Herbigny, basing his reasons on chapter V, places the date of composition during the reign ol *Vespasian 2* (the eleventh emperor, if Julius Caesar and Mark Antony are counted) shortly after the destruction of the Temple. There is nothing in the Epistle to render this opinion impossible.

II. THE HOMILY, CALLED THE SECOND LETTER OF SAINT CLEMENT'.

| This writing, which is given in the early manuscripts Immediately following the Epistle of Saint Clement to the Corinthians and purporting to be a second letter to them, fi not an epistle but a homily. It may no longer be

' Those who favour the first date depend on chapter IV, which supposes that I Huivß prophecy (VII, 7-8 and 24) concerning the ten-horned beast (the first fin emperors) has been realised: three of these emperors (the Flavian s) were to lu humbled by a lesser (*Nerva*). (See Funk and Bardenhewer). Those wl'i favour the other date (Harnack, G. Oger) base their argument on i Impter xvi, which they consider to be an allusion to the Jewish plan for the h building of the Temple at Jerusalem, during the reign of Hadrian, who was liiv urable to them, until the revolt of Bar-Cochba (133). The great expectations nl the Jews are precisely the subject of the "great scandal" spoken of in lihapter iv.

M. d'Herbigny, *La date de "l'Eplbe de Barnabi"* in the *Rech. Sc. Rei.* (mio), p. 417-443, 540-566. See also *ibid*, iv (1913), p. 402-408.

Γ · Editions: Funk, *Batres apostolici*, 1901; G. Oger, A. Laurent, *Les Apostoliques* (Coll. *Text. Docum.*), II, Paris, 1909.

Γ Studies: P. Godet, *Diet. théol.*, art. *Clément*, col. 5456; J. Tireront., *j'tia. Dogm.*, I (1st. ed.), p. 132-134. See also G. Oger, Introduction to his mllliini. --. ò

regarded as the letter written by Pope Soter to the Corinthians and which, as Saint Dionysius relates, was read to the Sunday assemblies, as was the first (ποστέραν) letter of Saint Clement.

The first four chapters speak of the excellence of Jesus Christ and the importance of salvation. In the following three chapters the author *introduces* his subject, the combat which Christians must engage with the world, and goes on to develop it in chapters vm-xvii. This *heavenly combat* is no other than the practice of the Christian *virtues* (penance, purity, charity, confidence, love of the Church). He concludes with an exhortation to serve God, no matter the cost.

The homily, although occasionally impressive, is full of tiring repetition, and is composed without any regard to style or method. This is enough to reveal the hand of an inexperienced writer, and definitely excludes *Saint Clement*, the talented author of the masterly Epistle to the Corinthians. Indeed, the early writers never ascribed this letter to him, and Saint Jerome even asserts that the Fathers explicitly rejected it. The points of resemblance which some critics perceive between this Epistle and the *Pastor* are far too vague for the purpose of proving its composition at Rome. On the other hand, the obvious allusion to the Isthmian games (ch. VII) would seem to point to Corinth as its birthplace. If this is so, it is easy to understand why this letter was classed with Saint Clement's Epistle in the manuscripts, and finally called an Epistle of Saint Clement. This is the reasoning of Lightfoot, Funk and Bardenhewer; it would seem sound enough. The absence of any definite reference to Gnosticism seems to indicate that it was composed during the first thirty years of the second century.

This homily, which from a doctrinal point of view possesses little value, is worth more for its *moral teachings*. It urges the practice of good works and penance on the faithful. Like Saint Paul (I Cor. IX, 24-25) it compares the Christian life to a combat (ἀγών). The author had witnessed, the nautical combats and the gladiatorial combats in the Stadium (ch. vn) and it needed but little imagination to transfer the word, exercises (ἀσκησι), into a religious context, where its use soon became classical in the sense of a spiritual combat.

III. THE TWO LETTERS TO VIRGINS.

These two letters, which in all probability were originally only one, were published for the first time in 1752 by J. Wetstein at Leyden, and attributed to Saint Clement of Rome. This attribution has been earnestly upheld by Mgr. de Villecourt² (Paris, 1853) and by THOMAS Beelen, in a vast treatise published at Louvain in 1856. Recent critics, however, do not admit the authenticity of these letters, judging them to have been composed in the third century, although F. Nau, contrary to the general opinion, thinks it possible for them to have been written in the second century⁴. Indeed, the itinerant preachers, who form the subject of these letters, lived very shortly after the Apostolic period. No special date can be assigned to the dangers arising from the relations of these latter with the Virgins or "sisters", although we can be sure that the precise rules which were drawn up for the purpose of removing these dangers date from a later period. Judging from these letters, they did not yet exist, nor is any allusion made to the community life of women consecrated to God.

It is certain that from the very beginning of the Church, even before the founding of the monasteries, a number of persons consecrated to God and leading a more fervent life than the others, was to be found in all the Christian communities. The observance of celibacy was widespread. Minucius Felix says of the Christians "*plerique inviolati torporis virginitate perpetua fruuntur*" (Octav. 31). These men and women often led a truly ascetic life, abstaining from meat and wine; they lived like the poor and often enough with the poor, usually, however, with their families, or in separate dwelling places. They were a living exemplification of Christianity. In their communities, they were indeed the cause of greater fervour: "*sunt enim utriusque sexus virgines pulchrum quoddam exemplar* (propositum et præsen-

Editions: In addition to those mentioned above, see Funk, *Patres æf. dolici*, 1901.

Studies: F. Nau, *Clementis (Apocryphes)*, in the *Diet. thiol.*, col. 219-222. I., Beelen for the early bibliography.

See P. G. I, col. 107-122 and 349-378 for the *introductions*, and col. 379-416 Kiel 417-452 for the *text and translation*.

Γ *Sancti Patris nostri Clementis Romani epistola bina de virginitate*, I vol., in 4°, 329 p., Louvain, 1856.

• • I. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 220-222.

tibus)! fidelibus et iis qui deinceps *futuri sunt fideles*", says the Epistle to Virgins ». But as there were necessarily various communications of a spiritual and temporal nature between the virgins of both sexes, due to the fact that the women found it easier to go for advice and protection to those who led a similar mode of life, certain inconveniences began to come to light. Some of these holy women went as far as living in the same house as the men, at the risk of provoking surprise, if not scandal. They were given the name of *συνεῖσακτοι*, *virgines subintroductæ* when an end was put to these practices at the end of the third century. Not that there was anything immoral in their behaviour, which found its justification in the lively faith and the simplicity of the first Christians.

The *Letters to Virgins* ascribed to Saint Clement make frequent reference to the perils of cohabitation and insist on the duties of virgins (chiefly the 1st letter) and itinerant preachers (in the 2nd letter). The first letter, consisting of 13 chapters, is chiefly theoretical and treats very finely of the general obligations of virgins, the need of combining faith and works with the renunciation of self, and the need of prudence in regard to passing and unauthorised preachers, who might lead them astray. In addition it recommends,; when possible, the care of children and the sick. The second letter, which in reality is only a second part in 15 chapters, exhorts those to whom it is addressed (the Christians of Syria and Palestine) to model their behaviour on that of the author's Own fellow countrymen (this country is not known)! The preachers avoid all cohabitation in divers cases which are mentioned, and various examples drawn from the lives of the Patriarchs or of Jesus Christ prove the wisdom of this conduct². All the advice given in the letter is excellent.

¹ *Epist. 1 ad virgin*, in. See P. Pourrat, *La spirit, chrét.*, p. 57-76, and P. Ladeuze, *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1905, p. 58-62, commenting an art. by H. Achelis.

² L. Nau, *op. at.*, col. 219-220.

CHAPTER Vili.

Hermas.

Special bibliography.

i. Editions: (T. 6., 2; X. FUNK, *Patres apostolici*, 1901; A. Belong, / *Pasteur d'Hermas* (coll. *Text. Documi*), IV, Paris, 1912.

. Articles and Studies: G. Bareille, *Diet. Mol.*, art. *Hermas*, ml. 2268-2288. A. d'Alès, *Edit. de Calliste*, Paris, 1914 (p. 52-113), it *Did. Apol.*, art. *Pénitence*, col. 1764-1771. A. Baumeister, *Die lithic des Pastor Herma*, Friburgim B., 1912. A. VacaNDARD, *Etudes...* [nt series, and various articles chiefly in *Rev. cl. fr.*, \cyrj. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I (1st edit.), 122-132; see particularly the 9th ed., 120 sq.; *Mélanges*, p. 20-43. P- Batiffol, *Etudes...* tst series p. 45-68; *L'Eglise liwûr. et le calk.*, p. 222-224. O. Bardenhewer, *Pat.*, I, p. 84-98; *taschichte der altkirch. Utt.*, t. I, p. 557-578. F. Cavallera, *Rev. Asc. Mystique*, I (1920), Oct., p. 351-360.

I. HERMAS AND HIS WORK.

The Muratorian fragment, dating from the year 200, declares: "And very recently in our own times, in the city of Rome, Herma wrote the *Pastor*, when his brother Pius, the bishop, sat upon the chair of the city of Rome". The witness <0> this contemporary document rules out Origen's identification of Hermas with the Hermas mentioned by Saint Paul in the Epistle to the Romans (XVI), nor can he be considered as living at the same time as Saint Clement; the reference to Pope Clement (in the vision 11, 4) must be o arded as an invention. The author was the brother of l ope Pius I (140-155) during whose pontificate the work was 10lnposed or at least brought to completion. Hennas also (ives us a large amount of information about *himself*, in leverai parts of his work. A member of a Greek and perhaps hristian family, he was brought to Rome while yet a young man and sold into slavery. He was bought by a Christian Indy named Rhoda, who freed him shortly afterwards. Il- married, and made his fortune in commercial venture and ii[[riculture. The moral well-being of his family, however, did not equal its material prosperity. He himself was a liar,

' A number of new manuscripts haye recently been discovered containing the [n>1 of the Pastor, particularly 25 papyri of the 4th century containing almost lmlf the work, from *sim. n.*, 8 to *sim. ix.*, 5. They have not yet been published.

his wife was a gossip and a shrew, and his children turned out so badly that they denounced their parents during a persecution. Hennas bravely faced the trial which had come upon him, but he lost all his wealth with the exception of a little farm which was just sufficient for his needs. The persecution had at least worked his conversion and made him a fervent Christian'. The incidents which he relates have their beginning at this moment.

They consist of a series of instructions on the *necessity and the efficacy of penance*, imparted to him by various persons whom God sends to him. First of all a noble matron, representing the Church, appears to him four times in succession and instructs him as to his mission. In the fifth vision comes a *shepherd* who remains to the end and tells Hermas the exact nature of the task he has to perform: this is the *Pastor*, the Angel of Repentance, who lays upon him the duty of preaching repentance and forgiveness to those who take heed. Hermas obeyed, and had the joy of seeing his own children converted before he had finished writing his book (for the work was composed at intervals).

The circumstances which impelled Hermas to write on the subject of repentance were, as we have already mentioned, the faults of his past life and his conversion in misfortune. The gravity of an unchaste thought which he had once had, was also revealed to him in a vision. Lastly, he was determined by the sight of the many shortcomings which he observed in the behaviour both of the laity and the clergy. He considered the Church as being a society of saints, and abhorred the easy-going teaching which denied the necessity of repentance³. But he did not fall into the opposite extreme of those who disheartened the faithful by teaching that there was no forgiveness for baptised persons who had sinned⁴. It was the purpose of Hermas to preach the possibility of forgiveness.

It may be that Hermas was not particularly fitted for this task. Although he was probably not the "petit bourgeois" that he has sometimes been considered, neither was he a fiery reformer. Perhaps he did not think of himself as a

' J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 22-23.

' *Ibid.*, 21-26.

³ P. Batiffol, *Études* (1st series), p. 48.

• A. u'Ai.fcs, *Edit. de Call.*, p. 71-73. «or.

• See J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, 23-24.

κ ruiner. According to Mgr. Batiffol and A. d'Alesl, he was a priest and also the spokesman of the Roman clergy of his time. He was, moreover, in these latter years of his life, a hasty and mortified priest, filled with a lively faith and anxious for souls. Judging by his book, he was not very tired nor very talented, neither was he a theologian. He is, however, an *excellent moralist*, a close observer of the manners of his day and moderate in his exactions, making a clear distinction between obligatory precepts and the counsels of perfection. The Shepherd is an extremely interesting work; it is the most useful and the most practical of the "prophetic" writings.

[The work cannot be regarded as the work of a prophet. Saint Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen considered it to be inspired and ranked it with Holy Scripture. Tertullian, in his Catholic days, was of the same opinion; later, however, he termed it a "manual of adulterers". The Muratorian fragment, Eusebius and Saint Athanasius, found it most profitable but did not liken it to the Scriptures. Saint Jerome thought that the account of the Angel Theophilus, in whom was committed the safeguarding of wild animals, was simply ridiculous (Vis. IV). After the so-called Decretal of Gelasius, the Popes placed it among the apocrypha and declared it to have no authority. Tixeront says that they certainly would not have taken this course if they had believed in the reality of the revelations of Hermas. These visions or revelations must be regarded as a kind of poetic licence or local colour employed by the author to give more weight to the advice and direction which he wished to give to the Church. [It is not easy to distinguish fiction from truth in this Writing. Bardenhewer³ thinks that not only the visions but also the biographical details, are due to the writer's imagination. We prefer to think that the broader lines of the narrative are true, although some of the details may have been invented by the author to illustrate his argument.

II. ABSTRACT OF THE SHEPHERD.

I Although it would seem that the *Shepherd* was not written at a single sitting and that its various parts were separated

¹ T. Batiffol, *loc. cit.*, p. 54-56; A. d'Alesl, *loc. cit.*, p. 112.

² J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 24-25; G. Bareille, *loc. cit.*, col. 2269-2270. *Pat. I*, p. 97-98; *Geschichte*, I, 570-572.

by fairly lengthy intervals, there is no reason to doubt the unity of the whole work. It had but one *author* and one *theme*. It is therefore quite legitimate to use the clear passages in one part to explain the obscure passages of another'. Whatever may be thought of the order in which they were composed, it is easy to distinguish three separate parts: the *visions*, the *mandates* or *commandments*, and the *similitudes*. The first part forms an *introduction* which gradually prepares the way for the other two, introducing in *tiao.first place* a woman representing the Church who informs Hermas of his mission (visions I to iv), and *secondly* the Shepherd (vision V) who remains on the scene right to the end. The Shepherd gives Hennas the *mandates* and the *similitudes* which form the subject matter of the two last and most important parts.

A) Visions:

1st vision. After having seen that he is accused in Heaven on account of an unchaste thought, Hernias perceives the form of a white-haired aged woman seated in a chair. She upbraids him for his carelessness in correcting his children.

2nd vision. He sees the same woman again, made younger, but still wrinkled and white of hair; she reproaches him again.

*3rd vision*¹. A young and joyous woman appears to Hernias and shows him the angels building a great tower, choosing the stones which are most fitted for it. She explains that the tower is the Church, the society of the saints both living and dead, who have kept their baptismal grace. The stones left aside by the angels, represent sinners; they need to be reshaped by repentance before they can be used in the building. Lastly, a young man explains to Hermas the meaning of the different forms in which the woman appeared to him: the first represented the Church, weak and helpless from the sins of the faithful (xi); secondly,^j the Church of the repentant, who hope for forgiveness (xn); thirdly, the Church of the forgiven, although still imperfect (XHI).

4th vision. First of all a horrible monster appears to Hermas and threatens to devour him. He then sees a maiden habited like a bride. She represents the Church washed of all its faults, as it will be in the last days, and reveals to him the terrible sufferings that man will have to undergo before attaining holiness.

5th vision. The young man who had already appeared to Hermas, especially in the 3rd vision, appears again. This is the Shepherd who is about to deliver to Hermas a series of precepts and similitudes.

¹ G. Bareillé, *op. cit.*, col. 2275; A. n'Aiks, *Edit. de Call.*, p. 58.

* See detailed summary of this vision in A. D'alès, *op. cit.*, p. 54-67.

II). Precepts *

This part is really a little moral treatise consisting of twelve precepts. They recommend the virtues and the good works which the sinner must practise in order to render his repentance efficacious. They are as follows: 1. faith and the fear of God; 2. simplicity and innocence; 3. truthfulness; 4. chastity; 5. patience; 6. faith, shown by docility in the good angels and resistance to the evil ones; 7. the fear of the Lord; 8. continence; 9. confidence in God; 10. cheerfulness; 11. the avoidance of false prophets (proud, sensual, greedy, self-centred men); 12. eradication of evil and envious desires. (The 4th precept is particularly important as regards penance).

C) Similitudes.

The third part bears a certain resemblance to the first. It continues to develop the same theme, in a series of comparisons and symbolic images. 1. The *true city* (country) of man, is heaven. Wealth must not be loved for its own sake in this world, for it is given by God so that the needy may be succoured. 2. As the *vine* clings to the *elm* and borrows it with its fruit, so the poor man relies on the rich, yet also helps him by his prayers. 3. In *winter* there is no difference between the *dead* and the *tree* which *lives*, and so it is with the just and the wicked in this world. 4. But in the summer, the *dead tree* and the *living tree* are distinguished by the leaves and the fruit, and it is thus that the just will differ from the wicked in the next world. 5. The Shepherd teaches Hermas that *outward fasting* must go hand in hand with a real *moral reformation* and the avoidance of unlawful pleasures. He then relates a parable of the *Master* and the *Servant* to show that the following of the counsels is voluntary but more meritorious than the carrying-out of the precepts.

The *A foolish flock* represents the great multitude of souls who are in danger of being lost, having been led into evil by the *Angel of desire*. The Lord God delivers up the erring sheep to the *Angel of punishment*, who chastises them severely in order to bring them back to the right path. Divine punishment is a part of the satisfaction owed to God on account of sin. 7. The Angel of punishment did well to punish Hermas himself. The sinner must submit to the blows and also do penance of his own accord. 8. An immense *willow tree*, sheltering all Christians, represents the Law of God given to the whole world (Simil., vili, 3). An Angel, called Michael, cuts its branches and gives them to each one. After a time they are collected. The condition of the branches reveals the state of their consciences. Out of thirteen classes of Christians, only three will go into the Church Glorious (the tower); these are the martyrs, the confessors and the just. All the others are sinners. In order to be saved they must do penance according to the directions of the Shepherd. 9. The ninth similitude again takes up the *symbol of the tower*, which was developed in the third vision, and brings it to an end. First of all

* See G. ΒΛΚΕΠ.Ι.Ε., *op. cit.*, col. 2276-2277.

See *Edit. de Call.*, p. 67-87; and *Did. Apol.*, col. 1765-1770.

This similitude is dealt with by A. n'Al.Ès, *op. cit.*, p. 87-88. See also Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 30-32.

Hermas is present at the construction of the tower (I-π). On the morrow, after spending the night in prayer in a company of virgins, he is given the explanation... In the middle of the plain of Arcadia(?) stands a rock (The Son of God) in which there is a door (The Son of God made man) surrounded by twelve virgins (symbol of the twelve Christian virtues). The angels build a tower (the Church) upon the rock with stones (the faithful) which they obtain from the streams (baptism) or from the twelve mountains (image of the whole world) and which must all go in through the door. Suddenly the work is interrupted; the master has come to try the quality of the stones. Many of them are cast aside and given to the Shepherd in order to be shaped again by repentance, after which many of them are used in the building. The rest are taken away by twelve wanton and beautiful women, dressed in black (the twelve vices): these stones represent the faithful who, unless they receive an extraordinary grace of repentance, are lost for ever'.

io. In this last similitude there is no fresh comparison, but Hermas is exhorted to purify his own house by repentance, and call everyone to repent, while the tower is yet building. Soon the tower will be finished and then it will be too late (The idea of an imminent *Secanti Coming* is everywhere apparent in the visions and the similitudes').

III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SHEPHERD.

Before touching on the teaching of Hermas regarding *several lesser points*, we will first deal with his teaching on *penance*. It would be well, in the first place, to see how penance was regarded in the Church in the second century.

A) State of Penance in the Church in the second century, Many and varied opinions have been held on this important question. We will only deal with the Protestant view which has been summarised by Harnack³. According to him the Church up to the third century did not consider that it had the *right* to forgive all the sins committed after baptism, and in *practice* did not ordinarily forgive them. The reason was that great sinners were no longer regarded as belonging to the Church, conceived as a society of saints. Later on, an evolution took place both in theory and in practice. *Catholics*, however, have always denied that any evolution took place in the right of the Church to forgive sins, for the Church has always been conscious of the *fulness of the power* which Christ gave her. Whether she has always used these powers in practice is another question.

F. X. Funk adopting the position elaborated by Petau⁴ in the seventeenth century, says that there is no doubt that until the time of Pope Callistus (217-222) the Church never forgave the three capital

¹ See A. d'Alés, *op. cit.*, p. 89-97; and J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 33-37.

³ A. n'Aifcs, *ibid.*, p. 82-83.

³ A. Harnack, *I^hrbtuhder Dogmengeschichte*, I, (1900), p. 439, sq.

⁴ Funk, *Kircheng. Abhandlungen u. Unterstuhungen*, I, (1897), p. 158 sq.

⁴ Petau, *Theologica dogmatica, De panit. publi.*, l. II, c. II, n. 3, 4>...
En. Guérin, 1870, t. Vili, p. 465.

adultery, idolatry, murder, and this Pope was the first to grant indulgence for adultery. It was only later that a like treatment was introduced to the other two sins.

11. *Vacandard** follows Funk in so far as the third century is concerned. He does not like to affirm that this penitential discipline goes back as far as the Apostles. But neither does he find any reason to doubt it. Mgr. Batiffol modifies Funk's opinion to a considerable extent. He declares that Callistus was not an innovator. It is untrue, say, as do the Protestants, that the Church had been a society without penitents for two hundred years and then had "consented to become a hospital for sinners only about the year 200"3; Callistus "opposed this disciplinary measure which was current in his day but which was neither universal nor traditional"4. Although the rigorous treatment introduced to these sins had not become general, "it was, at the time of the intervention of Callistus, an insidious current which threatened to envelope the whole Church"5. This influence was especially felt in Ulrica at the beginning of the third century, but it had already been prepared in the second century by the tendency of many Christians who multiplied the counsels with the precepts, and expected heroic virtue in everybody. This Catholic asceticism, before it finally came to rest in the sect of the Encratites, had a widespread intellectual influence in the Church, although in Rome it was counterbalanced by a milder tendency, which, however, must not be identified with the very lax holding of certain false doctors6.

Father A. d'Alès' also joins in the opposition to the classical theory that there were three reserved sins in the early Church. He declares that the rigorous measures that were observed in some regions at the beginning of the third century were not as important as they have sometimes been considered. Callistus, at the risk of playing into the hands of his enemies, did no more than assert the traditional power of the Church to forgive adultery. But Father d'Alès, like Mgr. Batiffol, recognises that not only was penitential discipline before the third century "marked with real severity"8 but also that there were possibly "preachers intent on terrifying sinners by teaching an inexorable discipline. Nevertheless he lays but little insistence on this rigorism. He is above all concerned with proving that there was no universal and official doctrine limiting the power of the Church, even in the form of voluntary renouncement of the use of these powers. His argument is based on solid grounds.

First of all, he points out that in the New Testament it was Christ's intention to link up the sacrament of *penance* with the very foundation

* *Rev. clergé franc.*, 1907, t. 50, p. 113-131.

1. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de théol. positive*, (6th edition), 1920, Paris. *ibid.*, p. XV.

2. *Ibid.*, p. XVII.

3. *Ibid.*, p. XXIV. On page 61 the author remarks that these three capital sins constituted three "veritable reserved cases".

4. *Ibid.*, p. 48-56.

5. A. d'Alès, *L'Edit. de Calliste*, and the art. *Pénitence* in *Did. Apol.* 1756-1784.

6. A. n'Ai.its, *loc. cit.*, p. 134.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

of the Church, and that the powers that He gave are unlimited. It is only the bad will of the impenitent sinner' that can limit them. It is very probable then, *a priori*, that this power entrusted to the Apostles was employed in the *first Christian communities*. The Apostolic writings inform us of the use that was made of it in the case of Ananias and Saphyra, of Simon Magus, and the sinners of Corinth. The Apocalypse also, after having dwelt on the faults, shows the way open to forgiveness. Nevertheless, the author concludes that one may look in vain for the "regular working of an institution whose benefits must certainly have been felt from the very first days of Christianity" ¹ J

After a detailed examination of contemporary documents which deal with penance in the second century, he arrives at the following conclusions: 1). The assurance of divine forgiveness for *all sins* is echoed by the whole voice of tradition. 2). The Church, *hierarchically constituted*, is the normal source of this pardon; there is no trace of the limitation of this power. 3). There are signs that an attempt to found a *penitential institution* was made, and that it was really severe in its exactions. 4). The *non-reiteration* of public penance is the only known law not having its justification in Holy Scripture. This law was probably introduced in the second century to prevent laxness. Hermas is the first to make reference to this ruling, which remained in force throughout the Church until the fourth century in the East and until the fifth century in the West. The Pastor, of all documents of this period, contains the most information concerning repentance and forgiveness. The next section will deal with its teaching.

B) The Teaching of Hermas on Penance.

1). In order to understand the teaching of Hermas on penance it is important to note his general attitude towards this question. It has been thought by some that he resisted with all his strength, all ecclesiastical indulgence for the sins committed after baptism ². Others have taken the opposite view and regarded him as the leader or the spokesman of those who advocated mildness in the face of the rising Montanist heresy ³. Both these views are exaggerated and false; his real position lay between these two extremes. Mgr. Batiffol says that he was a *moderate Encratite* who, while conceiving the Church as being a society of the perfect, was still able to see room for penance; he opposed'

¹ *Jbid.*, p. 12 sq. and *Diet. Apol.*, *loc. cit.*, col. 1756.

- *Ibid.*, p. 21-38, and *Did. Apol.*, *ibid.*, 1758-1762. The author gives an explanation of the three Scriptural texts that seem contrary to his thesis. It shows that "The Scriptures establish an essential relation between the effective damnation of the sinner and his stubbornness in turning away from God",

² *op. cit.*, p. 38-51.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 114-133.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 133-135-

• Funk, *op. cit.*, p. 171 sq.

⁵ Stahl, *Patristische Untersuchungen*, I (1901), p. 295.

the rigorists and at the same time humoured them * Father d'Alès holds the opinion that he taught a *kind of Encratism*, which caused him to preach the fervent practice of Christian law and to adopt a plan of life thoroughly Christian in all details, thus appearing in the light of a rigorist. All this, however, is a "case of personal fervour and not of ecclesiastical discipline" 2. Moreover, in spite of the stricter passages, the whole work is a justification of penance and it is this that gives it its character. Great attention must also be paid to the author's practical and pastoral intentions. Hermas does not speak as a doctor but as a zealous priest, careful to adapt his teaching to his flock. He preaches forgiveness in order that those who have fallen may be moved, but he limits it considerably lest others may be tempted to sin 3. He does not reject the teaching, given to the catechumens, regarding the one restoration at baptism, but he proposes another single chance of forgiveness after baptism. These contradictions would seem to be purely a matter of practical expediency.

I 2). Hermas laid great stress on the *necessity* and *efficacy* of *post-baptismal penance*, a). Certain imposters denied that the servants of God *needed to expiate* their sins (see Símil. Vin, 6). Hermas refuted them in a few vigorous phrases⁴ in the Similitudes viii and IX; he had no need to insist, for the error was but too apparent, b). His object «as above all to show the efficacy of penance: Mgr. Batiffol's remarks: "There is but one theme in the Shepherd; to restore the hope of salvation to the Christian fallen into sin". He teaches throughout "the forgiveness of sin, after sincere repentance"; the task of Hermas is to announce to those who have fallen that even for them, there yet remains the possibility of regaining salvation, on condition that they repent with all their heart. On this point Hermas was at one with the teaching of certain masters. It has been thought that these men were heretics, forerunners of the Montanists. According to A. d'Alès it is more probable that they were Catholic catechists "who deliberately limited

1 I. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 54-60.

2 A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 99 sq.

A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 71-73, 82-85, 101.

3 I. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 48-49.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 56-57.

their outlook to suit the needs of a definite class of listeners, that is to say, the catechumens and the neophytes " 1; they purposely omitted to speak of a possible forgiveness later on, lest they might seem to encourage sin. Hermas himself, impelled by similar motives also safeguards a high ideal of Christian life. But he has pity on human fragility and teaches forgiveness of the repentant. The clear affirmation of this doctrine is to be found in the third vision (of the tower) and in the *Similitudes vili* and *IX*25

3). The efficacy of Christian repentance is unlimited. Even the authors who admit the existence of three reserveil cases in the third century recognise this fact. Mgr. Batiffol in particular says: " If such is the principle of forbearance, it is obvious that no fault should be excluded... To be precise, adultery, murder, apostacy, the three sins which later on became three veritable reserved cases, are not excluded from the benefits of forgiveness " 3. Hermas does not speak of murder, but he particularly mentions adultery (Precept IV, 2) and apostacy (*Simil. ix*, 26).

Hermas gives three separate enumerations of the sinners who may have recourse to penance. In short, forgiveness is open to all; the only exceptions are those who refuse to do penance. The first enumeration is found in vision III, where various classes of sinners are represented by the stones which are considered unfit for *building the tower*. All these, whether they be black, split or chipped, whether they be white or round, cast by the wayside, in the fire or by the water-side, may all be used again in the building after they have been reshaped by penance. The same idea is brought out in the *similitude of the willow*; out of the ten classes of sinners who are mentioned here, only two are refused! salvation; these are the apostates and the traitors, not one of whom has repented, although they had all heard the Shepherd preaching forgiveness. Similarly, in the ninth similitude of the *tower built on a rock*, only the apostates, the blasphemers and the traitors are condemned because they are hardened 4. As in the previous similitude, on principle all sins may be forgiven 5.

1 A. n'Aifcs, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

= See J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 30-37.

3l. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

* G. Bareille, *Diet. thiol.*, col. 2284-2286.

5J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 124-125.

Uthough no sin of its nature is unforgivable, *certain* are not pardoned in practice. First among these, those neophytes who sin so soon after baptism that they must be considered as having no sincere purpose. Thirdly, those who after baptism have already been punished once, for there is but a single chance of forgiveness [Precept IV, 3, 4-6]. "Hermas is the first to speak of this law, which is certainly of ecclesiastical origin since it has no foundation in the Scriptures. It was probably introduced to cope with certain individual circumstances, but it gradually became a universal law and was not abrogated till much later. Although Hermas reveals its origin, he tells us nothing of its beginnings". This law lasted until the end of the fourth century in the East, and until the fifth century in the West.

Only a summary indication of the way of doing penance is given. Hermas makes a distinction between the *inversion* (μετάνοια), which is the work of the sinner, and the *function* (ιασι), which is the gift of God. God only gives this function after a laborious purification which "is placed between the conversion of the sinner and his cure", and which "contains the rudiments of the satisfactory elements of future penitential discipline". According to the description given in similitudes vi and vii this satisfaction was extremely moderate. It culminated in a complete renewal of the whole man. Some authors have expressed surprise that Hermas has not spoken of confession to a priest or absolution by the Church, and it has been supposed that this either did not enter into the purpose of the author or that as a layman he «is precluded from touching on these subjects». These objections have been strongly discountenanced by Father Hales. He shows that, apart from reconciliation to the Church, the idea of divine forgiveness is to be found in this work. Nevertheless it occupies but a very small space; "The penitential doctrine of the Pastor is wholly pervaded by the idea of the Church". He concludes: "We are of the opinion that neither the symbolism of the tower, nor the

n'ALFES, *op. cit.*, p. 134. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 65-66.

• P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 64-65.

• J. Fixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 38-40.

• *Ibid.*, p. 37-38.

A. n'ALÈS, *op. cit.*, p. 109-112.

• *Ibid.*, p. 104-108. See also Diet. Apol., *op. cit.*, col. 1771.

parallelism of the double repentance, before and after baptism, nor yet the whole of the work, have any acceptable meaning if they are regarded as representing anything other than repentance directed and controlled by the Church, and if inclusion in the building of the tower, is not taken in the meaning of reconciliation to the Church " *.

C) Other doctrinal features.

I. The ethics of Hermas is especially contained in the *precepts*, which have a universal application. It consists essentially in Encratism or continence (ἐγκράτεια). "Continence, as Hermas sees it, consists in abstention from all evil and the accomplishment of good. The Encratite should avoid adultery and fornication, drunkenness, theft, fraud, false witness, blasphemy and hypocrisy: he should practise faith, fear of God, charity, concord and patience: he should succour the widow, the orphan and the poor: he should be hospitable and a giver of alms. These are elementary commandments representing no more than the ordinary obligations of Christian life. Thus Christian life loses something of its heroism but becomes more practicable" 2J His high ideal of the holiness of the Church, does not prevent him from perceiving the single solid foundation on which it is built.

Conjugal fidelity is an outstanding note of his moral teaching. In the case of adultery on the part of the woman,] the husband may not continue to live with her, neither is he allowed to re-marry under pain of *adultery*. This supposes] that the original bond remains; Hermas, the moralist, is chiefly concerned with the need of giving the sinner an opportunity for repentance, so that husband and wife may be] re-united. (Precept IV, i, 4-10)3.

Justification received at *baptism* is the basis of Christian life. Baptism is so necessary that the just of the Old Testament had to be baptised by the Apostles before being' received into the heavenly kingdom (Símil. IX, 16, 2-7). This strange opinion was adopted only by Saint Clement of

* Mgr Batiffol also regards the Pastor as having its origin " in the Roman priesthood " whose teaching it expresses. *Op. cit.*, p. 55-56.

* P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 59. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. des Dogm.*, p. 125 126.

* See G. Bareille, *Did. thiol.*, col. 2286-2287; and J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 126.

Alexandria. Baptism is conferred by immersion, for "we « *tlocvn* as dead into the water, and *arise* from it living" i Simil. IX, 16) '.

Baptism, matrimony and penance are the *only sacraments* directly referred to by Hermas. He does not make the least (illusion to the Eucharist².

1. Hermas is not a theologian. Even in dealing *expro-teso* with the subject of penance he speaks more as a practical moralist than as a doctor. All the more reason, Ilien, not to expect in his work a treatise on the mysteries of [the Trinity and the Incarnations. In treating of these matters he employs a very imperfect terminology. Many i ritics, Catholics among them, have declared that his own expressions prove him to have identified the Son of God with the Holy Ghost⁴ and that he considered that the distinction of these two Persons was a consequence of the Incarnation. It is also supposed that he confused the Son of God with *Saint Michael* or with the *first*, "the *very*' venerable *angel*". In our opinion, however, such errors, consisting as they do in IIm negation of the most elementary Creed of Christian Antiquity, cannot be admitted as existing in a work which Im a considerable period, was ranked with the Scriptures, Unless definite proofs of such errors are produced. These nroofs are lacking. We think that the total absence of philosophical and even literary culture in this work has Hot been taken sufficiently into consideration. Hermas Hits inconsequently from one image to another and it is Indeed perilous to endeavour to build up a doctrine on 'neh an incoherent symbolism as this, or to educe it from tin use of the Greek article (τὸ πνεῦμα). It is very possible that these similitudes, and especially the fifth, which are the most criticised, really contain the ideas of Hermas ini the subject which he treats immediately, but not necessarily on the subjects which he only treats in passing. In any case the Early Church saw no unorthodoxy in the similitudes.

Bareille, *ibid.*, col. 2282.

1. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de thiol. posit., Eucharistie*, p. 33-34.

[1 Bareille, *Diet. th.*, 2278-2281 ; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, (9th ed.), K 126-127.

[' Ὁ δὲ υἱὸ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν (Sim. V, 5, 2) should probably be írii lated (indulgently) as "The Son is a holy spirit". J. Tixeront, *ibid.*, I 1*7.

The Angels enter for a large part into the Pastor. Hermas chiefly insists on their duties. He distinguishes the *greater* angels, who take part in the counsel of God, and among whom *Saint Michael* has an outstanding place, from the *lesser* angels who build the mystical tower. Everyone has a guardian angel (*angelus justitia*) who inclines him to good, and a bad angel (*angelus nequitia*) to tempt him

As has already been seen, the Church is often symbolised in the Pastor¹³ Besides being a society of saints, united in thought, faith and love, a wholly spiritual creation of God, she is nevertheless “constituted in local, visible and governed Churches”³. The information which Hermas gives us about the hierarchy leaves a lot to be desired. It should be remarked, however, that he attributes to Clement of Rome (vision II, 3) the power of sending the Pastor to all the Churches. This has been pointed out by Mgr. Duchesne⁴, who also notes that only two Roman writings (The Epistle of Clement and the Pastor), together with the genuine and spurious writings of the Apostles, have ever been ranked with Holy Scripture.

¹ Precept vi, 2.

² A. d'Alès, *Edit de Callisto*, p. 55-57, 65-67, 94-97, 104-108.

³ P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme*, p. 222-224.

⁴ L. Duchesne, *Eglises séparées*, p. 129-130.

SECOND PART.

THE FATHERS

01 THE END OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

The Historical, I Social and Intellectual Environment.

I. THE CHURCH AND THE PAGAN STATE.

I The second century was one of continual strife for the Church. Perhaps at no period of her existence has she been threatened with such serious opposition as she then was. In official persecution of the *Roman Empire*, upheld as it was by its men of letters and its apologists, did not present such a danger as the intellectual movement known as *Gnosticism*. This latter was encouraged and supported by the brethren from the Christian camp, the *Judæo-Christians*, and above all the *Montanists*. The entire literature of this period gives the impression that the Christians, whatever be their faith and confidence, were living in an atmosphere of timidity. The majority of writers are either *apologists* or *Controversialists*.

I It is not part of our plan to recount the history of the Church during the second century. It is necessary to recall, however, that although the Antonines, from Trajan to Commodus, may have been extremely solicitous for the well-being of the Empire, it was under their rule that the Church underwent a great deal of violence. This was due in the first place to the law of Nero, which, declares Terentianus, absolutely forbade the practice of Christianity. This law, although softened by Trajan's rescript (about 112), still no longer permitted the seeking out of Christians

* II: "Christianos esse non licet"; and *Ad Nationes* I, 7: "Perhibemus, erasis omnibus, hoc solum institutum neronianum". See P. Allard,

* *Christianisme et l'Empire romain* Paris, 1897, p. 19.

(*conquirendi non sunt*), was continually used as a threat, and was always applied in different provinces of the Empire. In addition, the Church invariably suffered after spasms of popular rioting, caused by the rumours and calumnies which the Jews exploited against the Christians. The Church had its martyrs, even under the better Emperors, such as, for instance, *Antoninus Pius*. She suffered even more under *Marcus Aurelius*, whose fine philosophical idealism, instead of inclining him to Christianity, made him think of it as a rival to his own teaching. There is no truth in the opinion that Saint Justin's philosophical apology had any effect on this cold and proud Stoic. It would seem, on the contrary, that Paganism at bay found in him a champion, who devised many ways of persecuting the Christians, whose patience has been regarded as fanaticism.

While the Empire was using the sword against the Church, the metaphysicians were attacking her with the pen. The greater number of these controversial writings were lost when the Edict of Theodosius I (about 445) ordered all writings against the Christians to be burned. The better known of these works were written by Fronto, Lucidius and Celsus.

Concerning *Fronto of Cirta* (d. 166?), the friend and preceptor of Antoninus, it is related by Minutius Felix (Octavius IX, 6; XXXI, 2) that in making a public speech he did not hesitate to accuse the Christians of great immorality after they had partaken of their ritual repasts, or even of assisting at the banquet of Thyestes. "It is astonishing", say Allard, "to see men of letters, occupying official positions, taking part in popular prejudice on the subject of Christianity".

Lucian of Samosata (d. about 190) is noted for his satire on the death of Peregrinus, which he wrote (about 167) against the Cynics and the Christians. Peregrinus is seen as a fallen Christian priest and Cynic philosopher who tries to commit suicide.

Celsus², a scholarly and cultured philosopher, was more to be feared than the palace orator and the mediocre satirist. His "True Word" has been almost entirely reconstructed from the quotations contained in Origen's refutation³. Written with great art and skill in about 171 this work consists of four parts; in the first part, a Jew shows how the Christians have deformed the Messianic ideal; in the second, a Pagan establishes the falsity of Jewish Messianism; thirdly, Celsus launches a direct attack on Christian faith and morals; and lastly he makes a defence of the ruling Paganism.

Celsus had closely studied the religion he attacked. He had read the Scriptures and brought to light seeming contradictions. He was also acquainted with the various sects which had perverted Christianity.

¹ *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1896, p. 55.

² See G. Barette, in *Diet. theol.*, art. *Celse*, col., 2090-2100.

³ See B. Aube, *Le discours véritable de Celse*, Paris, 1878.

1. 11ing, and therein he found an argument against the teaching of i Im I. Like Voltaire, he held Christianity up to ridicule in order to <1> noy it, and was just as unscrupulous in his deformation of texts and In Iory. He makes Saint Paul say : " Mala res est in hac vita sapientia, lion.i autem stultitia", instead of "Sapientia hujus mundi stultitia est ninni Deum" (I Cor. Ut, 19). Celsus was at the same time a philo-Inipher, a scholar and a scoffer; but, as G. Bareille* observes, he is Hinne all a politician. He wants everyone to follow the religion of his (oiiiiiry, saying that religious autonomy rightly belongs only to tradi-tional and national worship. In this he does but express the opinions bl the older statesmen of the all-powerful Roman Empire, which biolected all national religions, but was the implacable enemy of the universal tendency of the Church. The simulated contempt of Celsus hiles his fear. His lengthy diatribe is an unequivocal proof that the < lunch, at the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, was a power to be (minted with, and which the State could not afford to neglect.

II. JUDAEO-CHRISTIANITY

I It was the obj'ect of the Judaeo-Christians to combine pith in Jesus Christ with the observance of the Law of Moses [circumcision, sabbath, pure and impure meats) and to In.iintain the Levitical worship in the Temple of Jerusalem, khich they wished to remain the centre and the moral ■hector of the Church. A number of uncompromising biiiiiverts from the Pharisees, gave to all this the force of ilni'lina, and asserted that without these observances there li.l no hope of salvation. These were the men who brought Up the question of circumcision at Jerusalem and Antioch, inul who constantly contradicted the teaching of Saint Paul, Ivcn in the farthest mission fields, especially in Galatia. The Apostle called them *false brethren*. Others of more moderate views, who invoked the authority of Saint James ||ir Less, did not attempt to dogmatise but remained faithful ||i practice to all the legal prescriptions. They were uiuliably the cause of the difference between Saint Peter ||iiil Saint Paul at Antioch. Lastly, in the writings bl Saint Paul (Rom. XIV, XVI; Col. II, 16) may be found illusions to a third class of Judaeo-Christians, who were ■li kiers for extra-legal observances, proper to the perfect, bliii h they borrowed from various philosophical systems bml religions. This syncretism was chiefly practised by

111. Bareille, *Diet, th.*, art. *Celse*, col. 2092-2099.

* 1 Marchal, *Les Judéo-Christiens*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 1694-1708.

those who were easily persuaded by influences foreign to pure Judaism.

After the death of the Apostles and Saint James (d. 62), the Judæo-Christian community carried on with its own particular hierarchy until the time of Hadrian. In 61 it was transferred to Pella, where it continued to develop the tendencies it already contained. The *moderate* group appear to have remained orthodox. This group is now called the Nazarenos. They had already been given this name by Saint Jerome and Saint Epiphanius. There was but little difference between their doctrine and the common teaching of the Church. They used the whole of the Jewish Bible, but their canon of the New Testament was extremely succinct. Although not rejecting Saint Paul, they had recourse to very few of his writings; for their Gospel they used the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which is identical with the *Gospel of the Nazarenos*. This was not, as has been thought, the original Gospel of Saint Matthew, but a Jewish revised version written about the year 70'. Their moral teaching had a tendency to strictness.

The *uncompromising* attitude of the Judæo-Christians of the Apostolic age did not change with the death of the Apostles, and as time went on, it gave birth to the heretical sect known later as Ebionites. They had a Gospel which they said was according to Saint Matthew, but which, as Fr. Lagrange points out, in no way resembles the *Gospel of the Hebrews* of the Nazarenos. It is probably a recasting of the Gospel of Cerinthus. The accounts of the Holy Childhood and the supernatural conception of Jesus, which were denied by the Ebionites, were lacking in this Gospel. It has been said that the Ebionites were subjected to the influence of *Essenism*, but this is far from being proved. If this influence was felt at all, it was combined with the Gnosis and various other philosophical-elements in a syncretist cum Judæo-Christian sect, called *Elchasaism* after the name of its founder'.

III. GNOSTICISM \

A). Nature. — At the time of the appearance of Christianity, two great questions were attracting attention in the Roman Empire: *religious aspirations*, dissatisfied with official mythology were beginning to turn towards the strange Eastern religions, and *philosophy* was beginning to have a widespread popularity, due to the diffusion of the language, the writings and the schools of the Greeks. A new element was thrown into this general ferment by Jewish *monotheism* and *Christianity*. The importance of this must not be overlooked. The agitators were quick to seize on it and reshap-

1 See Fr. Lagrange, *EEvangile selon les Hébreux*, in *Revue Biblique*, 1921 (two articles), p. 160-181, 321-349.

"J. Tixeront, *Hist. ties Dogmes*, I, 189, sq.

* G. Barelle, *Diet. th.*, art. *Gnosticisme*, col. 1434-1467; L. Duchesse, *Diet. Apol.*, col. 298-312; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 192-206.

ii i- suit the tastes of the period. In our opinion, the Gnostic
 \ i k ins are derived from a *combination* of these four tendencies.

I Gnosticism may be generally defined as an attempt of
 philosophers to transform Christianity into a religious philo-
 sophy; or again, an attempt by the religious-minded to give
 It, the mysteries a philosophical explanation, better than that
 ■lplied by faith. The *Gnosis* (knowledge) takes the place
 kit faith. Later, chiefly in the third century, an *orthodox*
linosis attempted to explain the mysteries philosophically, in
ftnformiiy with the faith. But in the second century we find
 bly an *heretical Gnosis* seeking to take the place of Revelation.

I There is something splendid about the starting-point of
 Bnosticism. It consists of two ideas: i) *an exalted idea of*
 tW derived from Jewish monotheism, which is expressed in
 ■Wo words indicating His infinite remoteness from nature
 ■inl the hubbub of material beings: the Great Silence (Σιγή)
 ■ml the Depth (Βυθό); 2) the *idea of the great inferiority of*
At/tter, which is considered evil on account of its effects on
 Bin- hearts of men, whom it attracts and corrupts by turning
 ■lirm away from God.

I i'wo urgent problems arise out of this beginning: i) What
 I= the *origin of the world and of matter*? How could a
 ■trilect God create a being essentially evil? 2) What is the
 ■<wne of evil in the world and in man? Was it not created
 hm an essential part of nature by God, and is it possible for
 lumi) to be freed from it?

l'he Christian faith supplied the solution of these two
 ■nnblems: 1. God created the world "*ex nihilo*"; 2. The free-
 Boin given to man was the cause of evil coming into the
 IWik of God; it does not emanate from the Will of God, but
 ■nun created beings. Gnosticism was acquainted with these
 Hu" solutions, but finding them too *simple*, it attempted to
 llIn IX mate a more recondite one. The countless systems which
 lliun been developed by the Gnostics have one feature in
 ■mimon. They all suppose that between man and God
 mere exists an *intermediary series* which bridges the gulf
 Bielween created and uncreated being and allows man more
 Bi Uy to attain God.

II Doctrinal summary of Gnosticism. It is impossible to give
 ■l idea of each of the infinite variety of Gnostic theories. The main
 ■illines of the more outstanding among them are as follows:

' See G. Barcillb, *loc. cit.*, col. 1459-1463.

1. There is but one God; He is quite separate from material beings and is called the Silence or the Depth. He is essentially a *Power*, or a *Force* capable of development and expansion which reveals itself by successive emanations.

2. The Aeons are the intermediary beings between God and matter. Like God they are eternal, and emanate from Him in couples, male and female; these couples form what is called a *syzygie*. This first syzygie is produced directly by God, in Himself and of Himself; it then produces a second, which in turn engenders a third, etc. The complete series of aeons forms the *Pleroma*.

3. Proportionally as the aeons recede from God, they become less perfect: but in addition to this progressive depravation, a flaw or *deviation* takes place somewhere in the series; one of the aeons goes astray and is excluded from the divine pleroma. Cast out into the lower world, it peoples it with a fresh series of aeons which partake of the evilness of their parent aeon and are of an inferior nature to the aeons of the other series. This rejected aeon finally creates man and the material world. It is the Demiurge, the God of the Jews, an evil genius who must be resisted.

4. Man, however, is not entirely corrupt. A *divine seed* (spark, ray or perfume of the higher pleroma) had been detached from the superior sensible world by one of the higher aeons, and introduced into matter where it was held prisoner and persecuted by the Demiurge. Men may be divided into three classes accordingly as they possess or lack this divine spark, *a) Those under the influence of the spirit* (πνευματικοί) possessing the divine element and certain of salvation, *b) The Psychics* (ψυχικοί), who were not fully Gnostics, could be saved by the gnosis or knowledge, *c) Those under the influence of matter* (δλικοὶ) had no hope of salvation.

5. The sole purpose of the Redemption is the deliverance of the divine spark lost in matter. One of the first superior aeons was accidentally united to Jesus from the time of His baptism until His Passion. This aeon was only apparently endowed with human nature (Docetism). Salvation was not to be obtained through the merits of Christ, but through the *Gnosis* which was manifested in Him.

6. After the redemption of the divine element and the re-establishment of order in the higher worlds by the submission of the Demiurge, the universal restoration (ἀποκατάστασι πάντων) will be attained. The material world will be destroyed together with the things not destined to salvation.

7. The various sects derived contradictory moral conclusions from this nebulous metaphysics. Some taught that matter, that is to say, the body, was to be despised and subjected; others taught that it could be enjoyed with impunity. The latter were in the majority. More often than not, Gnosticism became a school of infamous practices.

C). The history of Gnosticism has never been adequately written. What we know of it is derived from the writings of Said

■ See in particular G. Barbillé, *Did. th.*, col. 1438-1456.

i. ns, the *Philosophumena* (Hippolytus), Saint Epiphanius and III, few remaining fragments of the one-time widespread Gnostic¹ Heliastic².

i i nasticism dates from the Apostolic times³. Judaeo-Christian «s» n reticism is due in part to its influence. The first author to have defined it to anything like a compact system would seem to have been

Magus. He was an educated man who stooped to magic to humiliate the people. But he was chiefly interested in philosophy and knew well how to adapt it to his own extremely popular teaching. This Jewish impostor lived with Helena, a prostitute, whom he made » prophetess and with whom he collaborated in his mission for the salvation of mankind. This man's Cosmology and Theogony, and his H...ies concerning man and salvation, make him the true founder of Gnosticism. There remain only a few extracts of his work *Ἀπόφασις* (Revelation).

■ The Gnostic teaching had its first growth in Syria, then in Egypt, and lastly throughout the entire Roman Empire, where it took on the Hellenistic scholarly form given to it by Valentinus the Alexandrian. The Gnostics may therefore be divided into three groups: the Syrian, the Alexandrian and the Valentinian.

I The Syrian Gnosis, closely related to Simon Magus, has three chief elements:

i. *Cerinthus*, native of Antioch, spread the doctrine in Asia Minor, where, together with the *Nicotaites*, he was resisted by Saint John.

I *Menander*, a disciple of Simon, who paid more attention than his master to the magical art.

I *Saturninus* or *Satornil*, the chief exponent of the Syrian Gnosis at the beginning of the second century. He invented a number of new rites, such as the spark of life sent into man by the Father.

■ The Alexandrian Gnosis was brought from Antioch by *Basilides*. He was the author of a theoretical system in which particular importance is attached to the *intermediary* world, lying between the *hyper-cosmic* world, inhabited by the unknown God, and the sublunary world, the world of man. The intermediary world consists of 356 heavens, of which the highest is termed the *Ogdoad*, and the lowest the *Hebdomad*. The head or archon of the Hebdomad is the God of the Jews, creator of the world and a prevaricator, like the archon of the Ogdoad and doubtless many others.

I The Alexandrian Gnosis is also represented by:

I *Isidorus*, son of Basilides;

I *Carpocrates*, who reduced immorality to a system;

¹ I de Faye in *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*, Paris, 1913, places too much reliance on these fragments, is somewhat neglectful of the Fathers and shows great partiality for the Gnostics.

² I first origins are so obscure, however, that they are regarded as legendary by many critics.

³ I their writings, see O. Bardenheuer, *Geschichte*, I, p. 313-346.

3). *Valentinus*, whose influence was so great that a special paragraph will be devoted to him below.

4). Lastly, a swarm of strangely named *sects*; *Cainites*, *Sethians*, and above all the *Ophites* (so called from the serpent, οφι, which enters largely into their system): these sects are responsible for a great deal of the apocryphal literature; for instance, various Coptic writings published in the nineteenth century (*Pistis-Sophia*, published in 1851; two writings taken from the Bruce Papyrus, etc.).

Valentinus carried on the work begun by Basilides. He was not perhaps a disciple, but he was acquainted with his doctrine which he taught and propagated at first in *Egypt*, his own country, and particularly at Alexandria. Later he transferred his activities to *Rome* (from about 135 to 160), where he was excommunicated more than once: he finally moved to *Cyprus*, where, according to Saint Epiphanius, he lost the faith entirely. He was clever enough to give to Gnosticism a most attractive form and gained many followers, both in the East and in the West. The Western writers modified the Docetist teaching and claimed that the Saviour possessed a "psychic" body. The better known of these writers are *Heracleon* and *Ptolemy*, together with the Apostate priest, *Florinus*, who was severely upbraided by Saint Irenaeus¹. The Eastern writers, among other things, taught pure Docetism. The most outstanding are *Theodotus*, mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and *Bardesanes*, or at least his disciples, for it would seem that he himself was chiefly interested in philosophy, the exact sciences and Astrology. Moreover, he was converted, and ranks with Tatian as the first great writer in Syriac Christian literature².

D) Marcionism² is a tempered form of Gnosticism. The authors of this sect are the Syrian, *Cerdo*, who came to Rome as a disciple of Valentinus and whose teaching he accepted with the exception of the metaphysics; and, above all, *Marcion*, son of the Bishop of Sinope in Pontus. He was a shipowner, but having fallen into sin, he was cast out of the Church by his father and came to Rome about 135, where he gave a great deal of money to the poor and was received into the Church. It was not long, however, before he was again cast out of the Church, for he himself was teaching heresy under cover of controversy with heretics.

His doctrine was a reaction against the extreme form of Gnosticism. He retained the substance of Gnosticism, however, as may be seen in his *Antitheses*, a collection of texts of the Old and New Testaments which he thought were contradictory. In order to explain these contradictions

¹ See below, p. 130-131.

² See G. Bareille, *op. cit.*, col. 1453-1456; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 206-212; and A. d'Alès, *Marcion*, in the *Rech. Sc. Relig.*, 1922, p. 137-141 dealing with A. V. Harnack's *Marcion*, Leipzig, 1921.

h rejected the authority of the *Old Testament*, which he asserted to be the work of a rigidly just, cruel and vindictive (nd. He admitted only that part of the *New Testament* (Gospel of Saint Luke and ten Epistles of Saint Paul) which reveals a good and merciful God. Thus the Gnostic dualism and the strictest Docetism remain in his work, although in an attenuated form. A rigid moral teaching is evident throughout his entire work.

This Gnosticism, "équipé à la légère", was nevertheless extremely i(doubtable. Marcion made many victims among the faithful and merited the name, "Wolf of Pontus", given him by Tertullian. Moreover, he organised a separate Church with a hierarchy which, in many places, survived until the fifth century. Since they rejected the [Old Testament, the Marcionites made use of psalms not contained in the Bible. The chief writer of the sect was *Apelles* (d. a little after 180), who, although he came back to Monism, maintained the gist of the founder's teaching in his "Syllogisms" (quoted by Saint Ambrose) and in his "Revelations", which he claimed to have received from an Inspired girl named Philumena.

IV. MONTANISM'.

I While Gnosticism armed itself with speculation and philosophy in opposition to the traditional teaching of the hierarchy, Montanism opposed the hierarchy directly by its profession of prophecy. Mon-Innism developed especially in Phrygia in Asia Minor in the second century, and in Carthage in the third.

With the advent of the second century, the possessors of the *charismatic gifts*, so numerous in the primitive Church, had nearly all disappeared. The Phrygian, Montanus, feigned to bring them back. Shortly after his baptism he was visited with transports and ecstasies; il, was in the year 156 according to Saint Epiphanius, or 172 according o> Eusebius. He announced himself to be the organ of the Holy Ghost. Il attracted many followers, in particular *Maximilia* and *Priscilla*, who, having left their husbands to follow Montanus, also had visions Hud became leaders of the sect. At first the Montanists desired to iruiain in the Church as a group more perfect than the others. But the Phrygian bishops, faced with their strange teaching and the disturbance they caused in every country, were obliged to resist them. But they i outinued to spread; in 177 the Church of Lyons, upset by the appea-nce of one of them in that town, wrote of it to the Pope, Saint Eleu-therius, and to the Churches of Asia. About the beginning of the third leutury they set up separate communities.

The doctrine of the Montanists may be reduced to two hoids : I. A *third and last Revelation*, that of the Paraclete

• |. Tixeront, *ibid.*, p. 210.

• A. D'Alès, *Théologie de Tertullien (Montanisme)*, p. 434-495). J. Tixeront, *Illa. Dogm.*, I, p. 215-220. P. de Labriolle, *La crise montanine*, Paris, 1913.

of whom Montanus is the organ, will *complete* the Revelation of Jesus Christ. Its characteristic will be a more abundant effusion of the charismatic gifts. 2. The *Second Coming* is imminent; Christ is soon to appear to reign for a thousand years over his people.

The new revelation was marked by an austere moral teaching, and suppressed certain allowances which Christ had made out of pity for the weakness of the flesh (1). Second marriages were forbidden, and perhaps at the beginning, even first marriages; 2). fasts were augmented in number; 3). lastly, sins committed after baptism were not forgiven. The Christians who were faithful to these practices were called *spirituals* (πνευματικοί), the others were only *psychicists* (ψυχικοί), as in the Gnostic system.

Montanism finally split up into different sects. There were Montanists *according* to Proclus, Montanists *according* to Aeschines, etc. The most celebrated sect was that of the Tertulhanists. Montanism did not disappear entirely until the sixth century. A number of Christians of Asia Minor, rather than embrace Montanism, rejected the Gospel and Apocalypse of Saint John, in which the manifestations of the Holy Ghost are announced. These are the Alogi, who deny the Logos preached in the fourth Gospel. Saint Epiphanius numbers them as a sect (the 51st on his list), but it would seem that he exaggerated the facts.

V. MILLENARIANISM.

Millenarianism was derived from the Jewish belief in the temporal reign of the Messias, which by some, had already been announced as lasting a thousand years. It was based upon a narrow interpretation of the Apocalypse and taught that Christ in His glory was to come down on the earth to reign for a thousand years among the just; after that would come the general resurrection and eternal life.

This error was fairly widely disseminated, even among the orthodox, during the first centuries of the Church. Caius of Rome and Clement of Alexandria say that it was fathered by *Cerinthus*, while Eusebius ascribes it to *Papias*. In any case it had a widespread popularity in Asia Minor where it was assimilated by the *Montanists*. *Saint Irenaem* and *Saint Justin* seem to have found it there. *Lactantius* and probably *Apollinarius* also adopted this teaching.

¹ V. Ermoni, *Les phases successives de l'erreur millénariste*, in *Rev. (H)ist.* 1901 (t. 70), p. 353-388. LÉON Gry, *Le millénarisme dans ses origines et dans son développement*, Paris, 1904. See also J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I. p. 222-225; F. Vernet, *Did. th.*, art. *Saint Irénée*, col. 2503-2505 and 2507.

Millenarianism was chiefly opposed in the East by *Origen* and /*nysius of Alexandria*; in the West by the priest, *Caius* of Rome (Ist century) and by *Saint Augustine*, who, at one time, had professed II himself. It was never condemned by the Church since it presented Imlittle danger. It disappeared entirely in the fifth century (*See the authors above mentioned*).

VI. ENCRATISM'.

I *Encratism* (from εγκράτεια, temperance) was a *rigid* moral limi ascetic doctrine practised by a certain number of i Inistians in the second century. The encratism of *Hermas* In nothing more than the tendency (excellent in itself) to Binpose on everybody the full observance of ordinary Christian morality. Other authors, however, went further. They jm had absolutely, under pain of sin, marriage, and the use of meat and wine.

This ascetism would have been an excellent thing if it had been < simply a matter of counsel; but it was not long in becoming heretical, Im m most cases it was based on the *Gnostic conception* of the essential iwilness of matter. However, it would not seem that the Christians who Were attracted by these theories ever constituted a *sect* in the proper unse of the word. The best known representative of heretical encratism hi '*Palian*, who allowed himself to be led into Marcionism (See below jli. iv). Many Encratites gained names for themselves in the calendars ill the heretics by their special practices of austerity.

CHAPTER II

The First Apologists of the Second Century.

Special Bibliography (for all the Apologists').

Editions: P. G., 6 (S. Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, S. Theophilus Ili'i mias). Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saec. II*, 8 vol., Jena, 1847-1872.

I Articles and Studies: Principal source, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IIm-fly bk. iv. G. Bareille, (*Les Pères*) *Apologistes*, in *Diet, th.*, Iol. 1580-1602. J. Tixeront, *Hist. des Dogmes*, t. I, p. 237 sq.

' 11. Bareille, *Encratites*, in the *Diet, th.*, col. 4-14. See also J. Tixeront, *Uet. Dogm.*, I, p. 213-215.

' The special bibliography for each author will be found on the pages where Ili work is discussed.

J. Rivière, *Saint Justin et les Apologistes du U^e s.*, {Collect.: La Pensée chrétienne), Paris, 1907. *Introduction* (p. v-xxix) by P. B. BATIFFOL.
 A. Puech, *Les Apologistes grecs du II^e s. de notre ère*, Paris, 1912.
 Mgr. Freppel, *Les Apologistes chrétiens au II^e s.*, 2 vol., Paris, 1860.

I. THE APOLOGISTS IN GENERAL.

The name of Apologists is given to the Christian writers of the later second century who worked to achieve a double end. On the one hand they sought to prove the innocence of the Christians in order to obtain tolerant treatment from the public authority, while on the other hand they endeavoured to prove the value and truth of their religion in order to extend its influence.

To this end they were not satisfied with only refuting their accusations to which the Christians were subjected (atheism, illegal worship, banquet of Thyestes, political burden and social uselessness). In addition they turned their attack on the Pagan stronghold itself, or devoted their talent to proving that not only is the Christian religion inoffensive, a respecter of established authority, but also perfectly in keeping with reason, whose powers it strengthens and completes. It follows that their writings consist of *apologies* properly so called, works of *controversy* and *treatises*.

The Apologies are directed either against the Pagans or against the Jews. Sometimes the *former* are addressed to a prince or to the senate (this was usually a literary device, for the work was usually intended for the public), sometimes to the people, to the crowd, and sometimes to one particular person. The writings *against the Jews* were also apologies, for there was no one more eager than the Jew to slander the Christians and denounce them to the authorities. They easily slip into the style of a treatise, however, proving the truth of Christianity by means of the Old Testament.

These works are of considerable importance. They represent one of the forms taken by apostolic *zeal* in the first Christian centuries. They are a *testimony* to the faith, and even more to Christian life, in a time when every Christian was called to be a hero. Moreover, from a *purely literary point of view*, these writings are superior to those of the Apostolic Fathers. Their authors were as a rule better educated and were often *philosophers*. So they remained after their conversion, when they put their philosophy at the

the vice of their faith. Christianity did not become hellenised, as some have held, but philosophy was Christianised. Their initiative in this respect had enormous consequences.

These diverse features, which are all so strongly brought out in the strong personality of Saint Justin, are found in the majority of the Apologists. For their *better understanding* it is important to remember that their *purpose* was above all to insist on points of contact between Christianity and reason, and to present the former as a form of wisdom. Their silence on certain points of dogma must not be regarded as » negation of those truths. Tatian, in his *Discourse to the Romans*, only speaks of the Word, and does not cite Jesus, although this most certainly cannot be put down to ignorance. Minutius Felix does not even name the Word. Not all these writers possessed Saint Justin's ingenuous and magnificent confidence in the power of truth and its simple affirmation. They thought they could bring the Pagans to it by degrees. Moreover, their *theological terminology* was not yet perfect and certain of their expressions must not be too closely examined; their doctrine, however, is most orthodox, and they err grievously who would make of them the forerunners of Arius.

It is their teaching regarding the Word which has aroused the most opposition. Yet they clearly affirm: 1) That the Word is *God*; 2) that He existed before all created being and has engendered; 3) that He is really *distinct* from the Father although *not separated* from Him.² But their teaching, if it is to be properly understood, must be envisaged in accordance with their philosophical tendencies. They are accustomed to consider the Word as the *organ* of Creation and of Revelation; thus they usually think of "Him and all that concerns Him, only in relation to the created world relating to the Creation "even His eternal generation, as if the Word had only been engendered in order to be a Creator"³. Given this view, it is easy to understand why this generation is presented as a work due to the free will and the power of the Father⁴, and why they suppose the Son to be subordinate to the Father, not only as regards his origin, but also as

¹ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 246-257.

S. Justin, *Dial.*, ch. 56-62; Theoph., *Autol.*, II, 22; Tatian, *Disc.*, 5; THEN., *Suppl.*, 10.

² J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 251-252.

³ See in particular S. JUSTIN, *Dialog.*, ch. 61, 127, 128.

regards his instrumental activity in Creation and Revelation. But it must not be thought that the Word is instrumental in these actions because of an inferiority of nature ; the reason is that it was willed as such in the *divine economy*. Similarly there should be no difficulty in grasping the famous distinction formulated by S. Theophilus of Antioch¹ between the two states in the Word: that of the *innate* Logos (λόγο ενδιάθετο) or the Word in the bosom of the Father, and that of the *uttered* Logos (λόγο προφορικό). It would be wrong to take these expressions too literally, and especially to regard the innate Logos as no more than an attribute of God. No doubt He is often termed the power of reason (λογικν, δύναμι) or again νοῦ, φρόνησι; but the "other" Word which is evidently personal also receives the same designation². In the Creation the Word is uttered, or, as Tatian and Athenagoras put it, the Word advances; this is not to be taken as meaning that He is engendered in the proper sense of the term, but that at the moment of the Creation a new modality is manifested in Him which reveals Him to the world.

There is yet another point in the doctrine of the Apologists which would have been better understood had more attention been paid to their point of view. At first sight it would seem that Saint Justin and Tatian deny the natural immortality of the soul, and consider immortality only as a privilege of the good, or a punishment for the wicked. Their sole reason for this was their identification of natural immortality with the immortality which is proper to God alone³. These few examples should suffice to show what prudence is necessary in examining any accusation of heterodoxy brought against these authors.

II. QUADRATUS «.

Quadratus (Κοδρατος) is the first known Apologist. He was an Athenian. "Greece", says Bardenhewer, "was the cradle of Christian apologetics in the second century, and the genius of the Greeks set its mark on them".

¹ S. Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Antal.*, π 10, 22. It is possible that this expression may be prior to Theophilus, although it is found for the first time in his work.

² See also Saint Justin, *Dialog.*, 61, 72.

³ J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

^{*} Rouet de Journel, *Enchiridion patristicum* (1922), p. 39. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, ch. 3.

1. Eusebius, who is the source of our information, says that he sent to Eusebius in (117-138) "a discourse containing the apology of our religion". This was probably during the Emperor's stay in Athens in 124. This was in the hands of Eusebius, who in order to prove its great value quotes a passage in which Quadratus affirms that certain persons who were either resuscitated or cured by Jesus still lived in his own time. This is all that remains to us of the first apology. It is possible that Quadratus, as Eusebius declares, was a disciple of the Apostles. In another place he speaks of a prophet bearing the same name who lived in Asia Minor. This also may be the same man. It is more probable to accept Saint Jerome's declaration that he was a bishop of Corinth at the same time that Dionysius was bishop of Corinth.

III. ARISTIDES.

Eusebius rounds off his chapter on Quadratus with the following words: "Aristides also, a faithful disciple of our religion, has left an Apology of the faith dedicated to the Emperor". His writing has also been kept by many, even to this day. This writing was lost from the time of Eusebius until it was discovered in 1899 by Rendel Harris, translated into Syriac in a manuscript belonging to the monastery of Sinai. Shortly afterwards it was also translated by A. Robinson, written almost entirely in Greek in the life of *Saints Barlaam and Joasaph* (or Josaphat) wrongly attributed to Saint John Damascene². Here the apology of Aristides is put into the mouth of Nachor, one of the characters in this famous legend, which in reality is no other than a Christian adaptation of the Hindoo life of Buddha. The original text of this Apology has not yet been uncovered.

The author introduces himself as an "Athenian philosopher". He develops a thesis based on the idea of God, which is given as the foundation of the truth of the Christian religion. He proceeds as follows:

1. That God exists is proved by the existence of the world and the things that are apparent therein. This God is eternal, impassible and immortal (ch. 1).

2. But, among the four groups of men of whom mankind is composed, the Barbarians, Greeks (including Egyptians and Chaldees), Jews and Christians, the Christians alone have a right idea of God and render Him a worship truly worthy of Him (ch. 2).

¹ Edition: R. Harris, A. Robinson, in *Texts and Studies*, t. I. Studies: I, *Barlaam*, *Diet, th.*, art. *Aristide*, col. 1864-1867. M. Picard, *L'Apologie de Barlaam*, Paris, 1892.

² See the Bollandist VAN DEN Gheyn's study in *Diet, th.*, art. *Barlaam et Joasaph*, col. 410-416.

The following chapters (3-16) prove these assertions: *a*) the Barbarian, adore only the elements or famous warriors (3-7); *i*) the Greek* (ch. 8-13) worship corrupt gods; *c*) the Jews (ch. 14) have often given more honour to angels than to God; *rZ*) the Christians (ch. 15-16) on the contrary, know and honour God in a becoming manner; this **iii** proved especially by the life that they lead, a life possessing an uncontested moral superiority.

Conclusion (ch. 17): Cease to persecute the Christians and be converted to their teaching! The treatise is brought to an end with a fine description of Christian life, which in many ways resembles the Didache and above all, the Epistle to Diognetus.

The outstanding points in this writing are, firstly, the idea of God which underlies the whole treatise, and, secondly, the argument drawn from the moral superiority of Christianity.

Celsus, who was acquainted with this apology, found in it many of the arguments he used against the Jews, and also certain features which he used in order to scoff at Providence.; He was easily refuted by Origen.

The writing of Aristides, although lacking in style and literary devices, reveals a penetrating and steadfast intelligence. According to Eusebius it was addressed to Hadrian, but recent critics think it was addressed to Antoninus, for judging by the superscription it was composed about the year 140.

IV. ARISTO OF PELLA³.

Maximus the Confessor (7th cent.) affirms that the first apology directed against the Jews was the "*Discussion between Jason and Papiscus concerning Christ*". Jason is a Judæo-Christian and Papiscus an Alexandrian Jew. It is not known whether these persons were real or fictitious.

"By passages of the Old Testament, by his clearness in showing that the prophecies were accomplished in Jesus Christ, by the sweet and tempered strength with which he strives against the stubbornness of his questioner, Jason is able to convince Papiscus. The Holy Ghost descends into the heart of Papiscus who admits the truth, and moved by the fear of the Lord, by the grace of the Lord Himself, he believes in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and asks Jason to give him the seal of life, that is to say, baptism"³.

Celsus despised this treatise, which he said was a tissue of absurdities. Origen, although recognising that it had not the worth of many other works in defence of the faith, did not hesitate to defend it. It is worth

* *Hist. Ecd.*, iv, 3. See also Hieron., *De viris illust.*, 20.

³ G. Bareille, *Did. th.*, art. *ζτρίστόν*, col. 1867-1869.

• G. Bareille, *op. cit.*, col. 1868.

noting that in this work appears for the first time the famous argument [...] the prophecies which is well calculated to make an impression on the rightminded and sincere Jew. Saint Justin states the same inhumanity with greater force in his *Dialogue with Tryphon*.

Aristo's work is lost. A fragment retained by Saint Jerome reveals [...] one of the objections made by the Jews against the Christians was that Christ died on the cross; the mystery of the Saviour's abasement was more than they could understand.

[1] We know that later controversialists made use of it, notably *Evagrius* (4th cent.) in his "*Altercatio Simonis judaei et Theophili christiani*"; [...] we are not able to say to what extent. The date of composition must have been about 140.

V. EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS'.

This little anonymous treatise is really the first outstanding Work of early Christian literature. Nothing is known of its author [2] nor of Diognetus to whom it is addressed. It may be that the latter was the Stoic philosopher, Diognetus, one of the preceptors of Marcus Aurelius. The older authors had no knowledge of this writing and it was published for the first time by H. Estienne in 1591 after a thirteenth or fourteenth century document, which was later destroyed in the bombardment of Strasburg in 1870. It certainly dates from between the first and the fourth centuries since the persecutions are mentioned in ch. 5-6. It should probably be ascribed to the second century, for it describes the main features of that period; the fervent life of the faithful, the violent hatred of fanatical Pagans, and the bitter scorn of the Jews. Its author has often been thought to be one of the Apostolic Fathers.

Judging by his work, the author was a highly educated man. Like Saint Justin, he was a kindly, sympathetic and zealous Christian, but much superior to him as a writer. In many ways the epistle resembles the best type of classical literature. It reveals a great delicacy of feeling, clarity of thought, lively and methodical development, brilliance of language and purity of metaphor.

[1] 1st Edition: P. G. 1167-1186. F. X. Funk, *Patres apostolici*, (1901), pp. 190-413. Studies: see P. Goulet, *Diognète in Diet. th.*, col. 1366-1369.

* It has been ascribed, but without sufficient evidence, to St. Justin. The Abbé H. DOULCBT has attempted to show that it was the work of Aristides, [...] pointed out a number of interesting similarities with that author's apology. *Ann. Quest. Hist.*, 1880, t. XXVIII.

The Epistle to Diognetus consists of only ten chapters. Some editions add two more chapters which are undoubtedly due to another pen. The author answers three questions put to him by Diognetus:

a). Why do the Christians separate themselves from the Pagans and the Jews? (ch. 2-4);

b). How do they live among themselves? (ch. 5-7);

c). Why did Christianity make such a tardy appearance? (ch. 8-9). I

a). The *Pagan worship*, which was given to inanimate idols (wood, clay, stone or metal), is an offence to God, and the *Jewish worship*, although rendered to the True God, is too material and uncouth to honour Him properly (ch. 2-4);

b). The *Christians live* in this world as though they were in it but not of it. Their country is everywhere and yet nowhere. They submit to persecution and by so doing accomplish their mission. They draw a blessing on the whole of mankind. They are the *soul of the world*. As the flesh abhors the soul which hinders its pleasures, so the world detests Christians. This Christian life, so elevated and so pure, has its source in the revelation given by Christ (ch. 5-7);

c). God sent His Redeemer so late that men might feel more deeply their corruption and their powerlessness (ch. 8-9).

To *conclude* (ch. 10) the author shows that it is because God has so loved the world that the Christians in their turn are become "emulators! of God" in charity, especially with regard to their neighbour; for such men the stake has no terrors.

CHAPTER III.

Saint Justin.

Special Bibliography (to complete that of Chapter II) J

Editions: L. Pautigny, *Les Apologies* (Coll. *Text, et Documents*'), Paris, 1904; G. Archambault, *Le Dialogue avec Tryphon* (samo collection), 2 vol., Paris, 1909.

Studies: G. Bardy, (*Saint*) *Justin*, in *Diet, th.*, col. 2228-2277. M. J. Lagrange, O. P., *Saint Justin* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1914. L. Feder, O. S. B., *Justins des Martyrers Lehre von Jesus Christus*, Friburg im B., 1906 (important dogmatic study). A. Bérý, *Saint Justin, sa vie, sa doctrine* (Coll. *Science-Reli*), Paris, 1911. Mgr. Freppki., *Saint Justin*, Paris, 1860. B. AubÉ, *Saint Justin, philosophe et martyr*, Paris, 1861.

I. LIFE OF SAINT JUSTIN-HIS CHARACTER.

Our information on the life of Saint Justin is furnished chiefly by Saint Justin himself in the "*Dialogue* *zpit*/"

liephon" (Prologue) and in his two "Apologies". The *Il tlogue* opens with an account of his own conversion (>li. 1-8). A relation of his death is given in the "*Acta A s Justin i et Sociorum*", which is of undoubted authenticity inid dates from the end of the second century.

i Saint Justin was born at Flavia Neapolis (Naplouse, IS. hem) in the middle of Palestine, at the beginning of the H<K>nd century (io o -i io). His parents were Pagan colonists, |jn>bably of Latin origin. He himself was brought up as h Tagan, and while yet young felt himself attracted to the ihlii'ly of philosophy. This was not due to mere intellectual ■iniosity, but to a hidden aspiration to perfect truth, to God. this attraction was destined to lead him to Christianity. ■Although the dialogued account of the development of his ■tiras may be artificially arranged as regards details, it is Undoubtedly exact in essentials.

I A first, Justin sat at the feet of a *Stoic*, but as he learnt Bathing new about God, he soon left him. A *Peripatetic* ■||.gusted him after a few lessons, by asking for a fee; this is ■Oinething unworthy of a true philosopher. Neither was he ■leased by a *Pythagorean* who refused to teach him anything until he should have learned music, astronomy and geometry, wlnally a *Platonist* arrived on the scene from Naplouse and lilr some time delighted Justin. His soul was seduced by llir contemplation of ideas: he would go away into desert ■llares near the sea in order to delight in the truth which In had found at last. It was by the sea, probably at l'iicsarea of Palestine, and not at Ephesus, that Christianity Ba l finally revealed to him by an old man who showed him ||i>w much was wanting in philosophy, even in that of Plato. B'ullying the advice of his new master whom, by the way, hr never saw again, he read the prophets and the preaching M< (l uist and was soon convinced " that this Christian philo- ■nphy alone, was sure and profitable". He was converted, ■nd from that moment began to lead the life of a true phi- ■Oiopher: "that is why and how I became a philosopher", |l< says to Tryphon.

I Alter his baptism he became a zealous apostle of the llrw philosophy. Persuaded that "to be able to speak the lluth and yet to remain silent is to draw down the anger of l>· "I" (Dial. LXXXII), he gave his whole life, even though ■ layman, to the defence and the teaching of Christianity. ■lie date of his conversion must be placed about the year 130,

for sometime between 132 and 135 we find him at Ephesus ¹, where he had a discussion with the Jew, Tryphon, which resulted in the writing of his great work, the "*Dialogue with Tryphon*" about 155. Twice at least he came to Rome. According to the Acts of his martyrdom, it would seem that he spent all the latter part of his life there, with the exception of one absence of unknown length. He always thought of himself as a philosopher, and, like other philosophers, he opened in Rome a school to teach his doctrine, something after the manner of the celebrated catechetical school of Alexandria.

It is probably while he was in Rome about 152, that he sent the Emperor his famous plea in favour of the Christians. His loyalty and courage are marvellously felt in the very first lines: "To the Emperor... Antoninus Pius... and to Verissimus (Marcus Aurelius) his son, philosopher... to the Roman Senate and to all the Roman people, in favour of men of all races who are unjustly hated and persecuted, Justin, son of Priscus... *one from among them*, addresses this discourse and this plea. One from among them, εἰ αὐτῶν ὧν: few words in all the early literature have more power to move, says A. Puech ². A few years later (the end of the reign of Antoninus, 132-161, or the beginning of that of Marcus Aurelius, 161-180), Saint Justin wrote a second apology, inspired by the new atmosphere created by the personality of the Emperor-philosopher, whose influence had already been greatly felt during the last years of Antoninus M. The following circumstance gave rise to it. A Christian woman separated herself from a debauched husband. The latter denounced Ptolemy, his wife's catechist, and Urbicus, the Prefect of Rome, had him arrested and executed, together with two of his companions. This so exasperated Justin that he again protested, to the rulers and to the Senate, against these injustices, and again proclaimed the innocence of the Christians.

In this second apology (ch. 3) he makes reference to the Cynic philosopher, Crescens, whom he accuses of immorality and ignorance. Crescens never forgave him. Although it is not related in the "Acts", it was probably this Crescens who

¹ During the Jewish war (132-135) caused by the revolt of Bar-Cochba.

² A. Puech, *Les Apologistes*, p. 52-53.

■ Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

denounced Saint Justin and caused him to be condemned to death about 165-166, together with six other Christians. Before becoming a martyr, he had led the life of an apostle and a saint: "The warmth of Saint Justin's convictions, the nobility of his character and the perfect straightforwardness of his behaviour have always been a subject of admiration", writes J. Tixeront, and Father Lagrange holds him up as "the patron of upright, sincere and valiant souls" 2.

II. WORKS OF SAINT JUSTIN.

A) General Description of his Works.

The *two Apologies*, the *Dialogue with Tryphon* and fragments of the *Resurrection* are the only authentic works of Saint Justin that remain.

In addition, the titles of various other works which have been lost are known to us: Saint Justin himself mentions (Apol. xxvi, 8) the "*Treatise against Heresy*", and Saint Irenaeus (Adv. Haer.) quotes a "*Treatise against Marcion*" which may only have been a part of the preceding work. Eusebius mentions five others (Hist. Eccl. IV, 18): 1) *Discourse to the Greeks*; 2) *Exhortation to the Greeks*; 3) *Treatise on the Divine Monarchy*; 4) *The Psalmist*; 5) *Treatise on the Soul*.

Many other works which have been attributed to Saint Justin are undoubtedly not authentic. Three of them bear the same titles as certain of the treatises mentioned by Eusebius: *Discourse to the Greeks*;—*Exhortation to the Greeks*;—*Treatise on Monarchy*. They date from the middle of the second or the beginning of the third century³. The seven others bearing his name in the complete edition⁴ of his works, have been erroneously attributed by the critics. Their titles are as follows: 1) *Letter of Aenas and Serenus*; 2) *Exposition of Orthodox Faith*; 3) *Refutation of certain Aristotelean Theses*; 4) *Answers to the Orthodox*; 5) *The Christian's Questions to the Gentiles*; 6) *Questions to the Gentiles*; 7) *The Trisile to Diognetus*.

From a strictly literary point of view, Saint Justin's work has a great deal to be desired. The chief fault of his composition is the absolute lack of logical order and method in the unfolding of his ideas. No doubt that in each of his writings he has a definite end in view, but instead of making himself clear for it, he digresses, lays unnecessary stress on accessory ideas, and even breaks off certain arguments only

¹ Précis de Patrologie, p. 46.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 203.

³ *J. G.*, 6, 241-326. It is very probable that it was these apocryphal works which Eusebius was acquainted and which he wrongly attributed to Saint Justin. See G. Bardy, *Diet. th., l. c.*, col. 2240.

⁴ *J. G.*, 6, 1183-1564.

to continue them later. Such being the case, any analysis of his work is not easy, and authors are far from being agreed as to the right divisions. Although his style is somewhat drab and sometimes incorrect, lacking elegance and distinction, it is noteworthy for its clarity and simplicity. Many passages are characterised by the warmth and life given to them by the writer's apostolic zeal and his ardour in discussion.

B). The Dialogue with Tryphon is a good example of the method employed by Saint Justin and the arguments he developed in his controversy with the Jews. The discussion with the Jew of Ephesus, which forms the main outline, would appear to be an historical fact, even though some of the details are fictitious. We cannot be sure that Tryphon is Tarphon, the celebrated Rabbi, one of the lights of Judaism, often mentioned in the Mishna, and who died in 135. It is very possible, however, that Saint Justin did intend this personage, even though he was not personally acquainted with him, since, as Lagrange says, Tarphon in no way represented the Hellenist but rather the Palestinian Rabbi, whose whole ideal was contained in Tradition and in the Law. Saint Justin endeavours to prove to him that Jesus was the Messias, and his religion was true.

The work, dedicated to an unknown person, Marcus Pompeius, consists of 142 chapters. The dialogue is supposed to last for two days and thus divides the treatise artificially into two parts: chapters 1-73 correspond to the first day, and chapters 74-142 to the second. The author was content to make this superficial division "the skeleton of his work" probably he did but follow the rhetorical rulings laid down in the schools of the period.

The 1st Part (ch. 1-73), with the exception of the prologue (ch. 1-8), is chiefly concerned with two ideas: 1. the *decay* of the ancient Law and its precepts; it is to be replaced by the Law of Jesus Christ, which extends to all peoples, dominates all ages and is obligatory for all (ch. 10-42); 2. the pre-existence of Christ, the identity of the Logos with the God who appeared to the patriarchs of the Old Testament, who spoke to the prophets and was made man in the virginal womb of Mary (43-73). The development of these ideas, however, is frequently interrupted by digressions on the wickedness of the Jews (16-17), on the two comings (30-39), (which latter is itself interrupted by another on the false brethren, (35-36), the precursor (49-52), the Mosaic rites (67), similarities of worship due to the devil (69-70), mutilation of the Sacred Text (71-73).

The 2nd Part (74-142) begins by taking up again the second subject of the preceding part, and in chapters 74-108 proves that the prophet proclaimed and testified that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. The latter half of this part is clearly dominated by the doctrine of the calling of the Gentiles (109-142): "Christian society, the work of the Apostles, is verily the race which was promised to Abraham and which is heir to all the promises of the Old Testament". The Dialogue concludes with wishes for the conversion of Tryphon and his friends (142).

It is important to note the attitude adopted by saint Irenaeus and the other orthodox authors when dealing with the Jews. Unlike Marcion who burnt the bridges between Jew: Synagogue and the Church, he always looked on the Old Testament as a preparation of the New and endeavoured to show that it was the prophets' divinely inspired task to prepare the way for Christian teaching. But Trypho was not converted. He took the prophecies one by one and applied them to Old Testament characters, or else denied that they were fully realised in Jesus. He was at least straightforward enough to admit that Justin had presented an attractive doctrine in a restrained and moderate manner.

(c). The Apologies are not works of art consisting of distinct parts neatly dovetailed together. Nevertheless in the first Apology three main lines of ideas may be perceived in ch. 1 to 20; 21 to 60; 61 to 68.

I. i. The first series (1-20) tends directly to *exonerate the Christians* from the crimes of which they were accused. 1) After having announced Justin's purpose (1-3), Saint Justin proves that their name alone is synonymous with honesty. He juggles with the etymology of *χριστιανό* in showing that it derives not only from *χριστός*, Christ, but also from *μῆτορ*, honest (ch. 4). 2) They are not Atheists, but the worship of *τὸν θεόν* is absurd (5-9). 3) They are honest and loyal, as is especially proved by their worship and the moral teachings of Christ (10-17). 4) The resurrection of the dead, motive of good morality, is not impossible to admit, even for the Pagans (18-20).

II. The second series of ideas (21-60) compares Paganism with Christianity and shows positively the *superiority of the latter*: 1) The numerous shameful Pagan fables, their debauched practices, their magic and sorcery, render them far inferior to the Christians (21-29). 2) The Jewish prophecies prove the Divinity of Christ; Saint Justin places his confidence in this proof and develops it at length (30-52); "We are confident that this proof will appear to you to be both convincing and irrefragable", he declares ingenuously to the Emperors (30). 3) Lastly, having noted that the prophecies call even the Gentiles to the Christian Faith, he shows that Paganism, and in particular the Pagan Philosophers, have plundered the divine Plato, have plundered what is best in the Bible itself in the prophets (53-60).

III. As a conclusion (61-68) he finds it necessary to prove to the Emperors that the practices of the Christians are in no way immoral: "if we were to omit this point from our exposition we would appear foolish in the wrong" (61). He therefore explains the ceremony of *Baptism*; *initiation* which he calls illumination (*φωτισμός*). After a reference to Pagan and diabolical similarities, and to the blindness of the Jews (62-64), he reveals to the public, for the first time, the sacred mystery of the Eucharistic sacrifice which was celebrated in the Sunday

¹ Cf. Barrov, *loc. cit.*, col. 2237.

² *Journ. G.*, 6, 327-440, Edition spéciale, L. Pau Ugnny, *op. cit.*

assemblies (65-67), and brings his work to an end with a magnificent apostrophe to the Emperors: "We say to you that you shall not escape from the future judgment of God if you persevere in your injustice. As for ourselves, we cry; may God's will be done"! Saint Justin attached to his Apology the rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus. Its authenticity is admitted by sound critics.

The 2nd Apology: 1. First, Saint Justin protests against the injustice of Urbicus (ch. 1-2) and denounces the calumnies of the Cynics, Crescens, whose immorality he reveals in chapter 3.

2. He answers an ironical question of the Pagans (Why do not Christians kill themselves in order to go to God more quickly?) by a condemnation of suicide (ch. 4), and explains why God does not deliver them from their persecutors (ch. 5-7).

3. He shows that the *moral doctrine* of the Christians is far more elevated than even that of the Stoics, and that their conduct is blameless (ch. 8-13). It is here in chapters 8, 10, 13, that he develops at length his new and original doctrine of the Seminal Word ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\ \sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$) of which the name alone was borrowed from Stoicism.

4. Lastly, he asks the Emperors to favour his demands and ordain that only regular proceedings should be taken against the Christians (ch. 14-15).

III. DOCTRINE OF SAINT JUSTIN.

It is possible, with Father Lagrange, to consider Saint Justin as a *philosopher*, as a *theologian* and as a *doctor of the Catholic Church*. Here, however, we will pay more attention to the first aspect of his doctrine, since it is that which best characterises his apologetical method.

A). Saint Justin, the philosopher. Saint Justin was a philosopher. He was proud of this title, but we know in what sense it should be taken after his conversion. It was then that philosophy became for him no other than Christianity itself. Nevertheless, in dealing with religion he did not hesitate to use the matter of the profane philosophy. In using this method he showed himself to be a pioneer especially as regards the doctrine of the Logos. In order to judge of the novelty of this method it would be well to remember the meaning of the Logos in Greek philosophy, j

I. The Logos in philosophy. The word Logos ($\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ word, reason) occupied an important place in the ancient philosophy, long before it was adopted by Christian theology.

* P. Allard, *Le christianisme et l'empire romain*, Paris, 1897, p. 41-43.

* P. G., 6, 441-470. Special Edition, L. Pautigny, *op. cit.*

* J. Lebreton, *Les origines du dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910, p. 41-73! 183-205. M. J. Lagrange, *Revue Biblique*, 1923, two articles.

¶//. *Uulus* (6th cent.) seems to have been the first to give the name
 ¶¶ i ... to a certain permanent principle of order and stability in the
 ¶¶H. i.i.d or rational world. This principle never transcended matter:
 ¶¶ Wan lire.

Kin ¶ her *Plato* nor *Aristotle* ever spoke of it. It was only later that
 ¶¶¶ Platonic *intelligible world*, the model and principle of the sensible
 ¶¶¶ came to be identified with the Logos; and this was also long
 ¶¶¶ Stoicism had similarly seen in the Logos the Aristotelean con-
 ¶¶¶ of nature; a principle of movement and of life which always
 ¶¶ in view of an end to be attained and does nothing in vain. The
 ¶¶ played a predominating part in Stoicism and Neo-Platonism.

I A ¶ pantheists the Stoics admitted no principle transcending the
 ¶¶ Min" i.e; the latter was perfectly sufficient to itself and found in itself
 ¶¶ Dlr *force* which moved it, and the *law* which directed it. The Logos
 ¶¶ Mi this immanent principle of order and life; the soul of the world, the
 ¶¶¶ it:me reason of what has been, is, and will be; it was often called
 ¶¶¶; σπερματικὸν inasmuch as it was a *seed* from which the world
 ¶¶ bui mated, and the vital force which animates it. As well as being the
 ¶¶ Itui" e, it was also the end in which all individual beings were finally
 ¶¶ Inni and annihilated. The Logos of the Stoics was God, or Zeus, the
 ¶¶ itlitr of the gods.

¶ The doctrine of the Logos was popularised by Stoicism, which was
 ¶¶ lu philosophy favoured by most people; it was even taken up by the
 ¶¶ Mioiples of Plato, who distinguished God from the world and made
 ¶¶ il Him a transcendent Being. "In this system", says Fr. Lagrange,
 ¶¶ in naturally had to be more or less identified with God, like His
 ¶¶ μιον, or His speech or word; as His *reason*, it became the centre of
 ¶¶ iln divine ideas, the ideal cause of the world; as His *word*, it became
 ¶¶ Illi instrument God uses for creation and government". Plutarch has
 ¶¶ lii"i described this Neo-platonician Logos with its two characters
 ¶¶ D('*dea* and *instrument* which take the place of the *law* and *force* of
 ¶¶ Hinn monism. It is no longer of itself a principle of life, but only of
 ¶¶ unci and harmony. It exists outside God in individual beings,
 ¶¶ rchicly in man in whom God has planted partial λόγοι, divine seeds,
 ¶¶ prim iples of order.

I ¶ the Greek Jews³ in their turn accepted the doctrine of the Logos
 ¶¶ incl adapted it to their Monotheism. This was chiefly the work of
 ¶¶ j'ulala. "Philo, a Platonician tinged with Stoicism and a resolute
 ¶¶ Munotheist adopted the Logos, but in the Platonician sense of exemplary
 ¶¶ Mini instrumental cause of the world. As he had a tendency to give
 ¶¶ ¶¶ h an elevated idea of God that God almost became an abstraction,
 ¶¶ lie found in the Logos a *useful intermediary* which exempted God from
 ¶¶ inV contact with the world and those upright souls who were not yet pure
 ¶¶ in high to attain to the contemplation of the sovereign good. Having
 ¶¶ Marched the Scriptures in order to discover the part played by the
 ¶¶ ¶¶ oi'<>s, he identified it with the Angel of the Great Apparitions. As the
 ¶¶ lii ii bom of God and empowered to speak to men in His name, the
 ¶¶ ¶¶ ugos was *God*, and Philo did not flinch from using this term. But if

¹ S. Justin, p. 159.

² I. K. Breton, *op. cit.*, p. 183-205.

one would grasp its personality, it slips away. The ray sent forth from the sun returns to its source, or separates itself from it altogether”’.

Neo-Stoicism, represented by Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius, was chiefly given to the study of moral problems. *Marcus Aurelius*, however, who made a greater effort than the others to understand the world and the destiny of man, based his ideas on the old Stoic teaching of the Logos. He was decidedly a Monist, says Lebreton, and thought of the Logos only as the *law* of the world, an inexorable *force*., sweeping all before it and sacrificing anything that stood between it and its end. It is the *universal mind* from which emanate all human souls and into which they enter again at death. “Thou art born a part of the whole”, writes Marcus Aurelius in his *Thoughts*, iv, 14, “thou wilt disappear in the being that engendered thee, or rather, thou wilt enter again, after thou hast suffered a change, into its seminal reason

2. Saint Justin's philosophy. Saint Justin's treatment of the doctrine of the Logos is all the more interesting inasmuch as he was probably the first among the Christian orthodox writers to give a clear exposition of this great philosophical concept. Saint John of course had already used the term Logos in the prologue of his Gospel, but can we be sure that he took it in the meaning that was given to it by the philosophers? It is a vexed question. Many Catholic writers have not hesitated to affirm that he did so. Some consider the prologue as an invitation to Greek thinkers, “an answer to the desires of Greek souls” who had been attracted by a certain theory of the Logos but had not found satisfaction in it³. Others say that Saint John was not immune to Alexandrian influence in adopting the *term* Logos. They recognise, however, that as regards the sense of the word, it is the Biblical tradition which predominates in Saint John and not Greek speculation, which has left its mark more especially in the writings of Philo⁴. In his recent commentary on the *Gospel according to Saint John*, Father Lagranges takes the view that Saint John was in no way directly *influenced* by the Alexandrian school, and that he did not even have the intention of opposing a content, porary theory which was regarded as dangerous. Apart from inspiration and the revelation of God, of which Saini

¹ Lagrange, *ibid.*, p. 159.

³ With the exception of the prologue, where it is given four times, this word is only found in the *Apec.*, XIX, 13, and I *Ep. Joan.*, 1, 1.

³ P. ROUSSELOT, in *Christus*, (edit 1916), p. 1017-1018.

⁴ J. Lebreton, in *Origines du dogme de la Trinité*, Paris, 1910, p. 388-389 and p. 515. sq. (Note I).

» Paris, 1925. p. CLXXVti-CLXXXiv, and p. 28-34.

John was the authorised channel, the Bible was his true and only source. The very word Logos was directly derived, not only as regards the term but also as regards the idea, from the Book of *Wisdom* and Saint Paul. If this is the case and Fr. Lagrange's demonstration is as convincing as it is simple and varied), *Saint Justin's originality* is obvious, he was really the first to stretch out his hand to those who were steeped in the Greek philosophy and its doctrine of the Logos. This intention, which appears nowhere in Saint John, is evident in Justin. It is chiefly to be noticed in his *second Apology*.

In his *first Apology*, it had been Saint Justin's intention to show that the Stoic and Platonic philosophers had borrowed the best of their teaching from Moses and the prophets. This was a current opinion among the Jews and was adopted by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius. In reality, however, this idea was groundless. Did Saint Justin discover this at a later date and write his second *Apology* as a correction? Perhaps. In any case he had perceived the gaps in his first theory and he tried to fill them up. In addition, he had probably become better acquainted with the writings of Marcus Aurelius and had been struck with their incoherence and the easy openings they offered to Christian philosophy.

In his *second Apology*, Saint Justin makes a distinction between the Perfect Word (ὁ πᾶς λόγος), which is the Word of God absolutely distinct from the universe, and the seminal word (σπερματικό λόγος). The latter exists in men, specially in the wise, not by emanation as the Stoics thought, but by means of a received and therefore distinct seed; it is human. By means of a wise and prudent activity it is able to rise to a partial and imperfect, but nevertheless very deep and very useful, knowledge of the Perfect Word, the Divine Logos. This was achieved by the early philosophers, Socrates and Plato. The full, complete and certain knowledge of the Logos, however, is only given by revelation; this is the knowledge of the Christians, and the Logos is Christ, in whom "he appeared for us, body, word and soul" 3. Their imperfect knowledge of the Logos caused the philosophers to

I.W.RANCB, *Saint Justin*, p. 132-133.

1/ «?», 134-144.

2 *Apoi.*, 10.

be persecuted by diabolical influence. The Christians are the victims of the same, and even more terrible violence, because they have a full knowledge of the Logos through revelation. Such are the essential lines of the doctrine developed by Saint Justin in chapters 8, 10, 13 of his *second Apology*. It should be noted that besides the transcendence of the Logos a double kind of knowledge is given to man: one is natural, produced by reason; the other supernatural, given by revelation and faith.*

Did Marcus Aurelius read this work, in which a philosopher presented a new Logos, somewhat different from his own? It is hardly probable. In any case he did not realise that the Christian doctrine of the Word was destined to renew the world.¹ In this respect Saint Justin's *Apology* did not achieve its purpose. But from another point of view his work had an enormous influence, for it already contained "an appeal to the *testimony of reason* concerning the essential truths which are also taught by Christianity: the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the distinction of good and evil, judgment after death, with its rewards and its punishments". True enough that we do not find in his writings "a methodical employment of reason in the explanation of the truths of faith", but Justin shows the way, by his alliance with Plato's spiritual philosophy. "Origen took up this great work, but with too much infatuation for philosophy. It was left to *Saint Augustine* to lay the foundations which *Saint Thomas Aquinas* used for the construction of the *Summa Theologica*. The modest pioneer, however, should not be forgotten" ³.

B). The theologian 4. *His teaching on God, and on the Trinity.*

I. It has been supposed that Saint Justin's taste for philosophy, and his ardour in making a pact, between it and Christianity, have led him, in some ways, to lessen Christian teaching. But it must be remembered that to his mind true philosophy consists less in speculation than in religion, the

¹ The first is a *seed* in relation to the second: this is a useful expression, but not to be employed rashly lest it lead to confusion.

* Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁴ G. Bardy, *Did. th.*, 0. c., col. 2244-2245.

Christian religion * and on the other hand he considers that rational activity, far from taking the place of faith, cannot even lead to it unaided. Faith is chiefly a gift of God to be inquired by prayer 2; it is also by prayer that a perfect Understanding of the Scriptures is acquired 3. These remarks should suffice to show that Saint Justin did not sacrifice or diminish revealed truth for the sake of reason. It is rather the contrary that should be feared. Let us make a closer inspection. Let us note especially how he was influenced by *Platonism*; it will enable us to fix his doctrine on God and the Trinity.

He was much less influenced by the other philosophies. He despised *Epicureanism* and classed Epicurus with Sardanapalus and with men of loose life 4; his disciples were treated with even less respect. He always had a real sympathy for the austere morality of the Stoics 5, especially that of Musonius, but he considered their metaphysics, the basis of morality, altogether insufficient; it lacks God, a living God: as in the moment of his conversion, this was always the objection that Saint Justin made to it. Although in his first Apology he employed the Stoic theories to prove the reality of eternal fire, he never nursed any tenderness for the material divinity of these philosophers. His orthodoxy was in no way weakened by Stoicism.

3. Had Platonism 6 a greater influence on him? He has been accused of *a*) denying creation *ex nihilo*; *b*) exaggerating the transcendence of God; *c*) subordinating the Word to the Father. On all these points he has been exculpated by either Lagrange.

Creation “*ex nihilo*” is nowhere denied by Saint Justin, and indeed is supposed not only by Holy Scripture, but in the first document from which he derives his doctrine and of which he quotes the first verse (“*in principio Deus creavit cælum et terram*”), but also by his theological doctrine of the Logos. When, in one of his Apologies 7, he states that God created everything from formless matter, he refers to a doctrine which he did not accept entirely, for elsewhere 8 he

* *Dialog.*, Vili, I.

4 *Ibid.*, vu, 3.

5 *Ibid.*, Lvm, I and *passim*.

6 *I! Apol.*, 6 and 15.

7 See Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 145-148. G. Bardy, *Saint Justin et le Stoïcisme* H. A. Sc. Relig., t. xiii (1923), p. 491-510, t. xiv (1924), p. 33-45.

8 See Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 149-174.

9 *I! Apol.*, 10.

10 *U Apol.*, 6.

makes a clear distinction between the creation and the decoration of the world.

b). The exaggerated transcendency of God found in Alexandrian philosophy, and more especially in Philo, did not penetrate Saint Justin's doctrine, in spite of the important place he attributes to the Word. This transcendency consisted essentially in the negation of God's substance, or in the absence of all relations with the world. Saint Justin avoided this double exaggeration. If he erred with regard to Plato, says his historian, it was rather "in reading the philosopher with a mind so preoccupied with Christian truth, that he thought he saw them in his text"

r). The Subordinationism which has so often been cast up at Saint Justin must also be attenuated, although some traces of it must remain. It is unjust to make too close an examination of certain expressions written at a time when the Jewish formulas, so strictly monotheist, were well known to all, and when Catholic terminology had not yet been fixed. Moreover, in writing *Logos* Saint Justin often means the Incarnate Word, Who, as such, is inferior to the Father (John, XIV, 23). If one examines his doctrine, subordinationism is seen under two forms; he considers the Word either as a necessary instrument of Creation or of Revelation]

On the first point Saint Justin has certainly not erred, since for him Creation is an attribute of the Divinity, or if he attributes it to a person, he refers it to the Father, instead of doing as the Gnostics did when they made a distinction! between the Supreme God and a Demiurge (creator) who, in this connection, would be the Logos engendered expressly for Creation, it being impossible for the Father to create. But Justin says that God created the world by His Word since that is His essential mode of acting and not because the Word was engendered for this purpose.

Elsewhere Saint Justin seems to make the Word the necessary intermediary for seeing God, since the Father is invisible. But it should be noted that such an error would be contrary to his philosophical notions; for he himself confesses that he had been foolish enough to hope to see God in

1 *Op. oii.*, p. 155. See also G. BARDY, *Diet. th.*, col. 2254-2256.

= In *Dialog.*, 56, the Word is called an "other God", which has sometimes been translated as "secondary God". In *I Apol.*, 10. He is simply called divine (θεῖο ὄν), etc.

Un world by means of the contemplation taught him by Platonism. His error must be regarded rather as exegetical, consisting in the simple exaggeration of a Christian principle, namely, that the Word was to become man. Taken up with the belief that the Logos appeared in the Old Testament, he insisted too much on the natural invisibility of the Father, as Father Lagrange remarks: "He did not believe that the Father was invisible, even with the grace of the Holy Ghost, nor that the Son was visible without that grace, save in the Incarnation".

Father Lagrange concedes that on one point Justin is open to criticism; this is when he repeats that the "birth of the Son" is due to a considered plan, to a free determination of the Father, without making any reference to the necessity of this Incarnation. He only expressed a part of the truth and probably did not wholly understand it². As we saw above (p. 108-109), it is perhaps possible to excuse him, even on this point.

Justin affirms his faith in the Holy Ghost³ as well as in the Father and the Word. On this subject his speculation soon dries up; his ideas are confused, says

Bardy, when he would explain the nature and the function of the Holy Ghost: nevertheless he was determined, in the main of tradition, to affirm the existence of the Third Person. And it is as a witness to tradition that his evidence on this point, as well as on many others, is valuable to us.

C). The Doctor of the Catholic Church⁴. Although a Martyr, he cannot be honoured as a Doctor, Saint Justin nevertheless well deserved this title:

By his perception of the unity of all Christians in the profession of a common faith. This is often affirmed in his writings, and was especially the subject of his *Treatise Against all Heresies*;

By his veneration for the Scriptures: in spite of his love of philosophy, it is only in what he called the *Memoirs of the Apostles*⁵, and in the writings of the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 170.

² *Unii.*, p. 174.

³ i. Bardy, *Did. th.*, 0. c., col. 2261-2262.

⁴ See Lagrange, *Op. cit.*, p. 176-193.

⁵ The three Synoptic Gospels, at least, are intended by these words. Various Minions also show that Saint Justin was also acquainted with the fourth Gospel. i. Bardy, *op. cit.*, col. 2247-2249. See Lagrange, *S. Jean*, p. xlviii-xtfx.

prophets, whose inspiration he roundly affirms, that he sought the sources of his doctrine.

3. By his outspoken profession of Christianity: unlike Minucius Felix, who in a well-turned Ciceronian style softens it down so much that it becomes a “sweetened Christianity”, keeping a fuller exposition of it for another occasion, Justin holds nothing back, and is convinced that others cannot remain unconvinced after having heard the whole truth. One may find the articles of the *Apostles' Creed* on practically every page of his works; indeed it has been reconstructed entirely with extracts from his writings.

4. By his clear affirmation of the Divinity of Christ and His mission of Redeemer: ²³ The Word was made flesh, *a*) first to teach the truth to men; *b*) to deliver them from the slavery of the devil. Without insisting on original sin, Saint Justin says that the sin of Adam brought us death, from which we are saved by the *death of Christ*. He explains the meaning of the Passion ³, chiefly by Isaías. Mary, who is opposed to Eve ⁴, is associated in the work of the Redemption. Of Mary, Saint Ignatius had already loudly affirmed the virginity and divine maternity, but it would seem that Justin is the first to explain her part in the Redemption.

On one point alone the traditional sense of Saint Justin led him astray. He admitted, probably after his visit to Asia, that *Christ* would have a temporal reign of a thousand years. He was aware that this doctrine was not believed by all Christians, but he considered it better to admit it.

His information on Catholic liturgy in the second century is also very precious. It chiefly concerns the Sacrament of Baptism, the Eucharist and the Sunday assemblies ⁵.

a) Baptism is described in Chapter 61 of the first Apology. Justin calls it illumination because, as he says, those who receive Christian doctrine have their minds illuminated: it takes place in a bath (λουτρόν), in which we are washed in the name of the Three Persons, and of which the effect is regeneration (ἀναγέννησις) ⁶.

■ Its two elements, Christological and Trinitarian, are there, in a disjointed but nevertheless precise form.

¹ J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1905, p. 114-115.

³ See *Dialog.*, ch. 43, 33, 89, 95, 117 and *passim*.

⁴ *Dial.*, ch. 100.

* *I Apol.*, ch. 61, 65, 66, 67.

• *Ibid.*, 61, 66, etc.

The Christian assemblies, which are chiefly described in the same Apology, consist of two parts (see ch. 67): 1) Sacred *readings*, followed by the bishop's *exhortation* and *prayers in common*; 2) the *oblation* of the bread and wine, followed by the *Eucharist* and finishing with the *communion*. Chapter 65, which describes the assemblies that take place after Baptism, omits from the first part the readings and the exhortation, and immediately refers to the prayer in common, to which is added the kiss of peace; the second part is in perfect agreement with the former description.

St. Justin does not only describe the Eucharistic liturgy, he also gives a simple *doctrinal* exposition, in chapter 66 of this Apology. It is in no way different from the present Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass. This idea of sacrifice is also treated in other passages of his writings, especially in the Dialogue with Trypho. All this is explained by Saint Justin with the untroubled sincerity of a believer, proud of his faith, and above all has confidence in the power of truth to draw men to itself.

CHAPTER IV.

The last Apologists of the Second Century.

Special Bibliography :

- i For the whole of the chapter, see the bibliography for ch. II, p. 107.
- 1 For each author, see the notes.

I — ch. 65-67. See Mgr. Duchesne, *Les origines du culte chrétien*, Paris, 1909, p. 50.

1) *Le culte*, 41, 10, 117. See Mgr. Batteol's fine chapter in *L'Eucharistie*, Paris, 1909, p. 31, the summary in ten theses, of Saint Justin's Eucharistic doctrine.

2) The Discipline of the Secret is quite unknown to Saint Justin. See Mgr. Batteol, *Eludes*, 1st series, p. 17-18, and *Diet. th.*, art. *Le secret*, col. 1749. Saint Justin's silence is one of the arguments against the existence of this law in the 2nd century.

I. TATIAN.

Tatian, one of Saint Justin's disciples in Rome, was born in Assyria about 120. He received a sound Greek education and was as remarkable for his scholarship as for his literary and philosophical culture. As a Sophist going from town to town to give lectures, he became acquainted with various religions, was initiated to several mysteries and finally became a convert to Christianity, probably at Rome. He followed Saint Justin's courses in that city, and after the death of his master he followed his example and opened a school. In the twelfth year of Marcus Aurelius, 172-173, he fell into the Encratite heresy. According to Saint Irenaeus, Tatian forbade marriage as if it were sin, and believed in the eternity of aeons. Clement of Alexandria was acquainted with one of his works on *Perfection according to the Saviour*, in which marriage was condemned; he refuted him with especial care in the *Stromata*. Tatian returned to the East, where he died at an unknown date.

Only two of the many works written by Tatian remain: the *Discourse to the Greeks*, composed about 170, before he fell into heresy, and the *Diatessaron* (το διά τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον), composed after his return to the East. This unique Gospel, fashioned by adding together the texts of the four canonical Gospels so as to form a single writing, was very popular in Syria until the fifth century, and was incorporated in the Syriac liturgy and commented by Saint Ephrem. Indeed, it is chiefly by means of this commentary that it has been possible to reconstitute in a great measure the text of the work which was lost. (See p. 380).

The *Discourse to the Greeks* has come down to its entirety. Tatian chiefly endeavours to demonstrate the superiority of the Christians over the Pagans (ch. 1-4: Introduction), both from a *doctrinal* (1st part: ch. 5-30) and from a *chronological* point of view. The *first* part shows that

¹ Editions: P. G., 6 and Otto (see ch. 11). Studies: A. Puech, *À l'occasion du Discours aux Grecs de Tatien*, Paris, 1903. O. Bardenhewer, *Alt. B.* p. 136140. P. Ladeuze, *Rev. Hist. Ecc.*, 1905, p. 356-360.

² See the summary of Clement of Alexandria's refutation of Tatian (671 ff in, 9...) in *Did. th.*, art. *Encratites*, by G. Bareille, col. 11-13.

• Probably in Syriac about 172. See R. Duval, *La Littérature* Paris, 1899, p. 44-45. P. Martin in *Rev. Quest. Hist.*, av. 1883, p. 349.

³ P. G., 6, 803-888.

mipriority respectively in the doctrines of the Logos, the Iv urrection, the angels, the soul, the mind, the world, etc... The *second* is chiefly a chronological discussion with the purpose of proving that the Biblical writings are much *tuUerior* to the works of the Pagans. As a scholar, the author Irnws up a *catalogue of the statues* which he has encountered In lióme in order to prove the immorality of the Graeco-Roinan artists.

I Tatian's character resembles that of Tertullian more than lliat of his master, Saint Justin. Like the former, he carries Ihings to excess, while his language is violent and full of mockery. His discourse is less of an apology than an attack bn all Graeco-Roman culture, which, together with the Pagan ■linons he crushes with his sarcasm. "He had nothing buiid to say of the Pagans: the art of the Greeks is immoral, iln ir literature is puerile, their philosophy mendacious, and ■Ven their language is neither consistent nor pure" J. Moreover, he had no reason to be so exacting. There are Jlcnty of faults in his own work. Like that of Saint Justin, Ms composition is often loose and neglected: his style is Mlrcted and plays to the gallery. But as a satirist he is illing and animated. Nevertheless, "he is a pretentious but lever writer", says A. Puech, and it would be wrong to mcird him as an uncultured barbarian 3.

II. ATHENAGORAS s.

I Athenagoras, whom Bossuet terms "the author of one of finest and earliest apologies of the Christian religion", Ki. according to the title of his Apology, an "Athenian, tini lian philosopher". Almost nothing is known of his hlr He is not even named by Saint Jerome and Eusebius, tliilip of Side gave an account of him, which still remains in mu, but which is erroneous on many points. We may •lieve that Athenagoras, a Pagan by birth, was converted bj' mdyng the Scriptures for the purpose of refuting Christia- ni\ It would appear that he followed the lessons of the

l Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, p. 53.

l li .ler, *De Tatiani dicendi genere*, Marò., 1909.

l ditions: P. § 6, and E. Schwartz (*Text. u. Unt. /7*), Leipzig, 1888.

ish : L. Arnould, *De Apologia Athenagora*, Paris, 1898. J. Tixeront, /c ..., p. 74-89. L. Chaudouard, *La philosophie du dogme delatésur- fh /i de la chair au IIe siècle*, Lyon, 1905.

catechetical school of Alexandria. About the year 177-1; he addressed to the Emperors, Marcus Aurelius and Commodus, "Germanic, Sarmatic, and above all philosophers" 1 a *Plea for the Christians* (πρεσβεία περί χριστιανῶν), and a short time afterwards composed a treatise *On the Resurrection of the body*. The date of his death is unknown.

In the latter writing¹, Athenagoras shows: 1) that the resurrection of the body is *possible* (ch. 1-10) since it is not repugnant neither to the knowledge, nor the power, nor the justice of God; 2) that this resurrection will really take place because it is *necessary* (ch. 11-25); this is proved by four reasons: the *destiny* of man, created for everlasting life; his *nature* which consists of two combined elements, the soul and the body; the *judgment* which is to be passed on the whole man, that is, on the body and the soul; the *last end*, which cannot be attained in this life. Thus reason confirms the data of faith.

But it is chiefly the *Apology of Athenagoras* that should hold our attention². Like Saint Justin and Tatian, but with greater order and method, it refutes the accusations made against the Christians: *atheism* (ch. 4-30), *immorality* (31-34) and *anthropophagy* (35-36). The *Introduction* (1-3) is addressed to the Emperors and indicates the purpose of the writing, while chapters 37-38, which act as a *conclusion* contain an appeal in favour of the innocent Christians, who pray for the welfare of the State and the happy transmission of the Imperial crown in the reigning family.

The Christians are not Atheists for they adore God; a God Who is one, although Father, Son and Holy Ghost. They do not offer blood-sacrifices; God only appreciates a spiritual sacrifice. They do not honour the gods of the Pagans, for these gods are unworthy of worship. Here the Apologist attacks and shows, firmly and moderately, that the supposed gods are but simple inanimate creatures, and the miracles which are attributed to them are the work of the devil.

The Christians are not immoral. For fear of divine punishment they condemn even the thought of evil. They conserve chastity in marriage and for them second marriages are decent adultery (rigorous opinion of the 2nd cent.). Those truly guilty of disorder are the Pagans. The provocation may well be quoted ἡ πόρνη τὴν σώφρονα (ἐλέγχει), vice accuses virtue.

Lastly, the Christians are innocent of anthropophagy. They have more respect for life than the Pagans, and avoid the games in the arena and condemn the exposition of children. In any case their faith in the Resurrection puts them on their guard against any such excess.

* P. G., 6, 973-1024. See G. BAREILLE, *Diet, th.*, art. *Athinagoras*, col. 147-71 C., 6, 899-972. See J. TIXERONT, *Mélanges*, p. 79-81.

The Apology of Athenagoras is rendered one of the finest in its elevated style, its sincerity in argument and its author's extensive knowledge. The composition is remarkably clear and methodical, while the well-turned periods are thick in ideas, and the reasoning solid and vigorous. The style is sober and precise, and sometimes concise even to brevity. The entire writing reveals an apologist who is at the same time a philosopher, and a master who argues according to the rules. Athenagoras was above all a dialectician, as Tatian was a controversialist and Saint Justin an ascetic. Indeed, Athenagoras and Saint Justin have several things in common, particularly the kindly treatment they mete out to philosophy and the philosophers, and their common endeavour to ally philosophy with religion.

In Athenagoras may be found the "first rational demonstration of the unity of God to appear in Christian literature", says G. Bareille. He was also the first to attempt a scientific demonstration of the *Trinity*. He has unreasonably been accused of *subordinationism*, "for of all the Apologists of the second century it is he who has the most forcefully and most clearly proclaimed the unity and the equality of the three Divine Persons. Neither is there anything that proves that he admitted a *nominal distinction* between the Holy Spirit and the other Persons, although he employs the comparison of the sun and the ray, which was condemned, perhaps wrongly, by Saint Justin".

III. SAINT THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH

We do not find in Saint Theophilus a philosopher apologist but a man of letters, of extensive culture, possessing a concise and elegant style combined with personal and biblical ideas. Although he was born near to the Euphrates, he received a Greek education, was converted by reading the Bible, and according to Eusebius was named bishop of Antioch in 169. Eusebius, however, errs in giving him a birth date in 177, for in his Apology he mentions the death of Marcus Aurelius, which took place in 180.

1. LIXERONT, *Mélanges*, p. 83. In pages 83-88 this author gives a summary of the doctrine of Athenagoras, notably his doctrine of the Trinity. This, well known, was dealt with by Bossuet in the famous *Avertissements aux évêques*, directed against Jurieu.

2. Edition: P. G., 6, and Otto (see ch. 11). Studies: A. Puech, *loc. cit.* in A. POMMICH, *Des Ap. Theophilus v. A... Logoslehre*, v. 1, 1897.

Theophilus was a fertile writer on all subjects, and besides the Discourse to Autolycus had also composed another work, probably apologetical, on the *origins of mankind* according to the Bible and mythology. He was also responsible for *various controversial treatises*¹ (against Hermogenes, Marcion), *pastoral writings*² (for the instruction and the edification of the faithful), and, lastly, *commentaries on the Bible*³ (Proverbs, Gospels) of which only the fragments quoted by Saint Jerome remain. Only the *three apologetic discourses* to Autolycus are extant⁴.

The first, in spite of its brevity, is particularly noteworthy for the insistency that the author lays on the subjective conditions of faith, the influence of the heart on belief. In answer to the scoffing Of Autolycus regarding the invisibility of the Christian God, the faith in the resurrection, and the name of Christian, he shows that God, invisible to the eyes of the body, can be known to some extent by the reason, still more by the faith of pure souls, and that one day He will be contemplated face to face in glory: "Show me what manner of man you are, and I will show you my God"⁵.

The second book (38 chapters) demonstrates the puerility of the Pagan doctrines, to which it opposes the teaching of the faith. In chapter 15, Theophilus expresses for the first time, by the use of the word *Τριά*, *Trinity*⁶; the personal distinction between the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, whom the author respectively calls *God*, the *Word*, the *Wisdom*.

The third book (30 chapters) refuted the usual accusations of anthropophagy and immorality; it then established by means of a chronological argument that the Bible is anterior to the Pagan legends, as Tatian had done before.

The composition of these three discourses may be placed about the year 180.

IV. EASTERN APOLOGISTS WHOSE WORKS ARE LOST OR ARE OF SECONDARY IMPORTANCE.

i. Miltiades⁸ was an Asiatic and probably a disciple of Saint Justin. In addition to various writings against the

¹ Eusebius, *Itisi. Eccl.*, iv, 24.

² *Ibid.*

³ St. Jerome, *De Viris Illusi.*, 25. See P. G., 6, 1603-1604.

⁴ P. G., 6, 1023-1168.

⁵ Δειξὸν μοι τὸν ἀνθρώπον σου, καὶ γὰρ σοὶ δεῖξω τὸν θεόν got (*Ad Auto!*, I, ch. 2).

⁶ *Ad Autol.*, it, 15. For Saint Theophilus' Trinitarian doctrine, see above p. 110.

⁷ *Ibid.* I, 7, it, 18.

⁸ See Otto, *Corpus*, t. ix, for accounts of this and the two following authors. The principal source is Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*; for Miltiades, see bk. V, ch. I.

Montanists and the Gnostics (chiefly the Valentinians), he composed three apologies: one *against the Greeks*, a second *against the Jews*, and another, addressed to the Emperors, "in favour of the *philosophy* that he followed". All are lost. He wrote during the latter part of the second century.

Apollinarius¹. He was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia in the time of Marcus Aurelius, to whom he addressed an apology about the year 172. He also wrote others, one *against the Greeks*, and the other *against the Jews* in two books. Neither of these, nor his two books *Truth* are extant.

Melito of Sardis². Melito, Bishop of Sardis in Lydia, died about 195, was a remarkably fertile writer. Eusebius, who drew up a catalogue of his works, cites twenty of them, while Anastasius Sinaita mentions two others.

None of these writings are now extant. Eusebius accords special mention to a short treatise addressed to Antoninus (Marcus Aurelius) τὸ πρὸς Ἀντωνίνον βιβλίδιον. This was a short apology which must have reached the Emperor about 172. A few extracts may be found in Eusebius. Another apology, which bears his name and of which only a Syriac text remains, is certainly not his. It is entitled *untillo Melitonis philosophi quæ habita est coram Antonino Ltrsare*. It was probably composed in Syriac during the second or the third century.

3. Hermias. Hermias, the philosopher, is the author of a *Satire on the Profane Philosophers* (Δ' ασχημὸν τῶν ἑξω Κλητόρων). This is a superficial criticism of the early philosophers and their unending contradictions, written in a light but witty vein. It is not without interest, but has very little value. It deserves to be called an apology only in a wide sense. Nothing is known either of the author or the date of its composition. Internal criticism, however, has some grounds for fixing the date at the end of the second century,

¹ See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv, 27.

² Eusebius, *Corpus*, IX, and *P. G.*, 5, 1207-1232 (fragments). Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iv, 26) gives a long enumeration of his works. Special study: C. Thomas, *Apollinarius Sardes*, Osnabrück, 1893.

* Citation: *P. G.*, 6, 1169-1180, and Otto, *Corpus*, t. ix, p. 1-31. Studies: Millier, *Ij:s Apologistes chrétiens*, p. 55-74 (ed. 1887), and G. Barchin, *LE*, VI, 111, art. *Hermias*, col. 2303-2306.

though some critics do not think it anterior to the fifth or sixth century.

V. MINUCIUS FELIX

Marcus Minucius Felix is the author of *Octavius*, according to Renan, "the pearl of apologetical literature"². He calls himself Marcus in his work (ch. II, 5). His full name is given by Saint Jerome and Lactantius. He appears to have been an African by birth and to have practised as a lawyer in Rome. The skill shown in the composition of the book reveals his talent and fine literary culture. He was brought up as a Pagan and converted to Christianity fairly late in life. The two friends whom he introduces in his book are known little better than himself. *Octavius Januarius*³ who gives the title to the book, was a Christian, also converted from Paganism at the same time, or shortly before Minucius. *Caecilius Natalis* is a Pagan, probably a native of Cirta (Constantine), but also living in Rome. An Arch of Triumph was erected at Cirta by M. Caecilius Natalis, then triumvir under Caracalla. This was perhaps the same person.

The work of Minucius which relates the conversion of this Caecilius consists of two main parts: *a*) a defence of Paganism by Caecilius himself (ch. 5-13); *b*) the victorious answer of Octavius (14-38). Chapters 1-4 describe the circumstances of the discussion, and chapters 39-41 relate the conversion of Caecilius and bring the book to an end.]

After having introduced his two friends, Minucius takes the reader to Ostia, where the three of them have gone for their holidays. Their work in the law courts is finished and it is the time of the wine press. During the morning walk, Caecilius salutes a statue of Serapis; this gives rise to a discussion which lasts all day. The three friends stroll themselves on a breakwater stretching well out into the sea. Minucius seated in the middle of the group, presides over the debate and acts as an arbitrator (ch. 1-4).

First of all, *Caecilius* pleads the cause of Paganism and exposes frankly the complaints of the Pagans. He commences with a formal declaration of agnosticism. The Universe is an enigma and truth cannot be attained; we know nothing of the gods, and their intervention in the affairs of the world is chimerical. Nevertheless the Roman

¹ Edition: P. L., 3; J. P. Waltzing, edition, translation and commentary, Louvain, 1903. Studies: P. de Labriolle, *Hist. litt. lat. chrét.*, p. 148 and P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. Af. chrét.*, i, p. 462-508; A. N. At. iis, *Le plus icrit chrétien en langue latine*, in *Etudes*, 1905 (t. 104), p. 454-479; G. B. Hnl TOLDI. At. *Atinuoio F. e suo dialogo Ottavio*, Rome, 1906.

² In *Marc-Aurèle*, p. 389.

ni mil is a beneficent national institution: it must be safeguarded. 11 · Christians are unwise in attacking it, especially as they are far from 1» : irreproachable. This is followed by a violent attack on the i In Tians; they have formed an impious, criminal secret society; their Hilation of a crucified God is absurd, and foolish their belief in the |<r nrrection. Hence no religious innovation is needed. There is Jntling wiser than the doubt taught by the Academy (ch. 5-13).

i < /avius, in his turn, begins to speak, and, following his adversary tli'P by step, he refutes his complaints and accusations, and turns licm against the Pagans. He proves, first, by the harmony of the miM, the existence of God and His Providence; he then establishes lm unity of God and the unreasonable character of Roman Polytheism, llich is the work of devils and condemned by the philosophers them- nl s; lastly, he shows that the accusations made against the Christians ic baseless, and, having given a moving description of their way of h, he concludes: *cohibeatur superstitio, impietas expietur, vera religio /wvetur* (14-38).

< lecilius confesses himself to be beaten, and asks for a little more Um mation before becoming a Christian (39-41).

l he *Octavius* is a masterpiece, not so much perhaps by |n· originality of the ideas as by their perfect expression and cvlopment. The method is wholly classical and the purity ltd the harmony of the language attains the standard l the best Latin prose. Moreover the elegance of the form l combined with great depth of feeling and even the bnt contradictions are tactfully and considerably expressed. l polished man of letters, Minucius Felix was also a scholar, Idlliil enough to turn to the best advantage the various Icnients that he borrowed from the ancients, chiefly Cicero nd Seneca, whom he never quotes but whose mannerisms, lords and expressions abound in his writingsl.

l ; the *Octavius* the earliest Christian literary work to < written in Latin? For many years it was considered as ding posterior to Tertullian's *Apologeticum* which it utilised, 'hi ; traditional opinion has been defended in our own days y Massebieau, Harnack, P. Monceaux. The contrary pinion (according to which Minucius was imitated by ritullian) took first place, however, for some time at the id of the nineteenth century, after it had been proposed

I'bert; the arguments produced by Harnack against this iti i have not shaken it altogether, and his arguments IBinselves are of doubtful value2. Thus the *Octavius*, which i i certainly posterior to 175 (date of Fronto's death men-

1 Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 490; P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 171-172.

2 A. d'Alès in *Études*, article above mentioned.

tioned by the author), is probably anterior to the Apologeticum; but if this is not the case, it must date from the first part of the third century.

It is extraordinary how little space Minutius devotes to the exposition of Christian dogma. Although G. Boissier¹ sometimes exaggerates the many shortcomings evident in the work, there is no doubt that the *Octavius* gives but an imperfect idea of Christianity. It should not be thought, however, that the author had but a superficial veneer of Christianity. The *end* he has in view is a sufficient expiation of his method. His purpose was to give to Roman society an apology of Christianity which would fully satisfy their refined taste in literature. Their doctrinal education could be left till later, when they had decided to become Christians. No doubt Minucius reduced his *Creed* to its simplest form in the *Octavius*, but it must not be forgotten that his book was not intended to be a catechism, but only a simple introduction².

CHAPTER V.

The Controversialists of the Second Century.

Special Bibliography.

Principal Sources: Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* iv and v; Saint Jerom³ *De viris illustribus*. Studies: Bardenhewer, *Pat.*, I, p. 225-229 *Geschichte...* I, p. 481-535.

I. THE CONTROVERSIALISTS IN GENERAL.

As opposed to the Apologists who strove against tin Pagans and the Jews, the controversialists are those win defended the true faith against heretical perversions. In tin second century they were confronted by two importan heresies, Gnosticism and Montanism. That they encounter⁴ a considerable amount of opposition is proved by the greti

¹ G. Boissier, *Lafin dupaganisme*, Paris, t. I, 1891.

² P. de Labriolle, *Op. cit.*, p. 155-171.

number of authors who wrote against them, although, for the most part, the works of these writers are no longer extant.

Several of these *controversialists*, who were also *apologists*, have been already mentioned'. These are :

i. *Saint Justin*, who wrote against all the heresies, and in particular against Marcion (see p. 117).

ii. *Saint Theophilus of Antioch*, who attacked the Gnostics (see p. 133).

Miltiades, who refuted the Montanists and the Gnostics (see 134-5).

Apollinarius of Hierapolis, author of a pastoral letter against the Montanists, which was signed by several other bishops (see *ibid.*).

Melito of Sardis, an indefatigable writer (see *ibid.*). The fragments of his work which remain seem to show that his teaching was very unfamiliar to that of Saint Irenaeus, who will be dealt with below (ch. vi).

II. THE CHIEF CONTROVERSIALISTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

I. The names of a great many controversialists are known to us only through Eusebius. As regards *Montanism*, we will mention only those since who were of especial service to Eusebius in his history of that heresy; an unknown Phrygian, Apollonius and Caius. Rhododolphe and Igesippus are noteworthy in connection with *Gnosticism*. Saint Irenaeus, the most outstanding of all the authors of this period, will be dealt with in the following chapter.

i. The Adversaries of Montanism :

i. An anonymous writing³, composed in Phrygia between 192 and 193, contained a refutation of Montanism and a history of its prophets, in three books. The author, an absolutely unknown bishop or priest from eastern Phrygia, dedicated his work to a certain *Avircius Marcellus*, whom he probably had Abercius whose epitaph has since been discovered.

ii. Apollonius⁴, an "ecclesiastical writer", says Eusebius, was Bishop of Ephesus (according to the *Praedestinatus* of the 4th century), and also wrote a book against the Montanists, cited by Eusebius.

iii. Caius, Roman priest under Pope Zephyrinus (199-217), rejected the authenticity of the Johannine writings the better to refute Montanism. It may be that he did not attack the Apocalypse in his *Dialogue against Montanisi Proches*,* which was refuted by Hippolytus in his *Contra*

' S. Justin in ch. iii, and the three others in ch. iv.

' See J. Tixeront, *Hist. des dogmes*, (1st ed.), I, p. 260-261.

' *J. G.*, 10, 145-146 or Routh, *Reliquiae*, 2nd ed., n, 181-217. Mere mentions cited by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 16-17.

' *J. G.*, 5, 1381-1386, (*Adversus Cataphrygas*). See G. Barthelemy, *Apollonius*, in *Diet. th.*, col. 1507.

• *Hist. Eccl.*, V, 18.

• *J. G.*, 10, 25-26, (fragments) from Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 20. See L. Lagrange on Caius, *Evangelium selon Saint Jean*, Introduction, p. 14-15.

Caium, but that he bolstered up his thesis by attacking the fourth Gospel in a subsequent writing, which caused Hippolytus to write against him for a second time. Saint Epiphanius gave the name of Alogi to the adversaries of the Logos. He thought them to be a sect living in Asia Minor at the end of the second century, but it would seem that he was grossly misinformed. It appears that these were really Christians who, in order to destroy all scriptural justification of Montanism, rejected the works of Saint John, which were misused by the heretics. But they did not form a sect. In this sense Caius was an Alogus, and it has even been said "the only known Alogus". His intentions were excellent; he combated at the same time, the Montanists and the Quarto-decimans. He was apparently never condemned. But his negations were never followed by the Roman Church.

2. The Adversaries of Gnosticism :

Rhodo one of Tatian's disciples in Rome, but a native of Asia, wrote a treatise against the Marcionists during the reign of Commodus, and perhaps undertook the refutation of his master, Tatian. Saint Jerome was going on insufficient evidence when he attributed to him the Phrygian anti-Montanist writing mentioned above.

Hegesippus (no?-i80?), a Palestinian Jew converted to Christianity, visited the various Churches in order to judge of the uniformity of their faith in the face of the rising heresies. He came from Corinth to Rome in the time of Pope *Anicetus* (i55-156). Having returned to his own country, during the pontificate of Eleutherius (174-179), he drew up his *Memoirs*, ὑπομνήματα, from the notes he had taken during his journeys. According to the *Pascal Chronicle* he died under Commodus (180-192).

The work of Hegesippus has been regarded as the first ecclesiastical history ever to have been written: this was Saint Jerome's opinion. But according to Eusebius, it were better to consider it as a polemical writing composed for the purpose of proving the truth of the official teaching of the Church *against the Gnostics*. It is based on reasoning, but still more on facts. Like Saint Irenaeus, it insists on the uninterrupted[^] succession of bishops since the beginning, which is a guarantee of the apostolicity of their doctrine. While at Rome he had drawn up a list of the Popes as far as Anicetus. A few fragments cited by Eusebius and some other authors are all that remain of his five books. He was a mediocre writer, but a perspicacious observer and a sincere witness. 1

Among the fragments of Hegesippus which are still extant, we would mention a precious list of the Jewish and first Gnostic *sects*, and also an account of *foe brothers of Jesus*. Unfortunately his catalogue of the first Popes is lost.

---- »0^X0«----

¹ P. G., 5, 1333-1338 (five fragments of *Adversus Marcionam*), Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, V, 13.

³ P. G., 5, 1307-1328 (five fragments from the *Memoirs*). See G. Bakkellit, *Hightsippe*, in *Did. th.*, col. 2116-2120. St. Jerome, *De viris illust.*, 22.

• Lightfoot thought he had discovered it in Epiphanius, *Hares*, xxvi, 6, but other critics, Funk in particular, contest this identification.

CHAPTER VI.

Saint Irenaeus.

Special Bibliography.

i. Edition: P. G., 7 (Latin translation and Greek fragments of the *Adv. Heereses*), P. O., 12 (1919) for the *Demonstration of the Apostolic preaching*.

Studies: F. Vernet, (*Saint*) *Irénée*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 2394-9533. A. DUFOURCQ, *Saint Irénée* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1904. A. DUFOURCQ, *Saint Irénée* (Coll. *La Pensée chrét.*), Paris, 1905. I. Tixeront, *Hist. des dogmes* (1st ed.) I, p. 247-262; (9th ed.), p. 237 et sq. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante...*, p. 247-274; *Etudes d'hist. et de théologie posit.*, 2nd series, p. 167-188. A. D'Alès, *La doctrine de l'Esprit en Saint Irénée*, in *Rech. Se. Rel.*, 1924. Freppel, *Saint Irénée*, Paris, 1861.

I. LIFE OF SAINT IRENAEUS—HIS CHARACTER.

I The first historical mention of Saint Irenaeus is in the year 177, when he was a priest of the Church of Lyons, Governed by the old bishop, Saint Pothinus. Some Christians coming from Phrygia had informed the confessors of the Faith at Lyons, several of whom were natives of Asia, that according to the Phrygian prophets, the second coming of Christ was imminent. Knowing that the Pope was being solicited to confirm the condemnations which had been passed on the Montanists by the bishops of Asia, the faithful of Lyons wrote a letter on the subject to Pope Pius I (175-189) which they charged Irenaeus to take to Rome. Irenaeus is mentioned therein as being "full of zeal for the Testament of the Lord" and as "a priest of the Church". It was probably this journey to Rome which saved him from the persecution that broke out in Lyons in 177-178, and of which Saint Pothinus was the first illustrious victim.

I Irenaeus must have occupied an important place in the Church at Lyons for on his return from Rome he was chosen to succeed Saint Pothinus. This choice was due to his origin and his character.

B Saint Irenaeus was a native of that Roman province of Gaul which, as A. Dufourcq remarks, "formed with Rome,

the poles of the Christian world". He had never been attached to any particular bishop, nor had he been a disciple of any outstanding individual, but he had listened to many presbyters, the immediate disciples of the Apostles, and among them especially Saint Polycarp. He twice mentions the preachings of the latter and thus allows us to ascertain the approximate date of his own birth; at the latest about 140, at the earliest 120-125. He may not have known Papias, but he was acquainted with his book, from which he borrowed some few legendary details. He arrived in Gaul with the many missionaries who came at that time to bring or spread the Christian faith'. He must have reached man's age, since he had completed his intellectual and religious education.

Together with his attachment to tradition which he had learnt from Saint Polycarp, and his love of the *Scripture!* which he knew perfectly, and which he quoted on every possible occasion, he was best characterised by the depth of his *faith* and the breadth of his *knowledge*, qualities which no doubt marked him out for the episcopate.

He was highly educated and had read many Greek authors both literary and philosophical; but abstract speculation which he regarded as the chief source of Gnosticism, had little attraction for him. He was, as Tertullian calls him "a curious explorer of all doctrines" — he made a special point of knowing all the heresies in order to refute them and render more certain the triumph of the true faith.

The apostolate of Saint Irenaeus took on three forms. Of these three his struggles against Gnosticism are the most glorious. This heresy was ravaging Gaul as well as Italy and the East, from whence it had probably been brought by travellers. At the request of a friend, a priest and perhaps a bishop, of Greek origin and knowing Greek Saint Irenaeus made a point of exposing the Gnostic doctrines, for "to reveal their system is to vanquish them". This first writing was soon followed by four others containing a direct refutation, which together form the *Adversus Hæreses*. The real title was *The false Gnosis unmasked and refuted*.

' It has been conjectured that he came to Rome with Saint Polycarp in 15; where he stayed for some time, perhaps following the lessons of Saint Justin, and then from Rome went to Gaul. See F. Vernet, *Diet. th.*, col. 2394-2395.

aint Irenaeus also laboured to spread Christianity in the provinces adjacent to Lyons. There is no doubt that, in view of the relative youth of this Church founded by Saint Irenaeus, the vigorous personality of its bishop helped Lyons to become the Christian metropolis of Gaul as it was already the political metropolis. "Its bishop", observes A. Dufourcq, "watched over the rare Churches scattered around, and although we cannot precisely measure his missionary work, we can see that certain Churches, those for instance of Arles, Nîmes, Uzès, and Valence, claim that Saint Irenaeus was the first to announce the Gospel to them" *.

The intervention of Saint Irenaeus in the Easter controversy about 190, in the time of Pope Victor (189-198), was of considerable importance. The Church of Asia Minor was accustomed to celebrate Easter on the 14th Nisan (the Hebrew month of March) as did the Jews; Rome celebrated it the following Sunday. About the year 155, Saint Polycarp and Saint Anicetus had vainly tried to come to an agreement. Pope Victor made up his mind to put an end to the controversy and at his request, councils were held throughout the whole Church. They all accepted the Roman date, save the Asian bishops and Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, who was refused to resist by the tradition of his Church, an Apostolic foundation. Victor excommunicated these bishops. Irenaeus, who thought this was going too far, intervened with the Pope in their favour. It is not known what action was taken by Victor, but it is certain that the Church of Asia adopted the Roman use in its turn and followed it, at least from the beginning of the fourth century. All these facts are a striking manifestation of the Roman Primacy, and it was nothing derogatory to it in the action taken by Saint Irenaeus.

The date of his death is fixed by tradition in 202-203. Before dying, he had the anguish of seeing Lyons partly destroyed and looted in 197. On the word of Saint Jerome, Irenaeus was the first to give him that title in 410, the Church honours him as a martyr. It is truly strange that neither Eusebius, Hippolytus nor Eusebius mentions this fact; Irenaeus certainly renders the traditional opinion somewhat

* Dufourcq, *op. cit.*, p. 53, after the *Acta Sanctorum*, 16 June, p. 7 (*Acta Irenaei*).

1. VF.RNRT, *op. cit.*, col. 2438.

doubtful. Nevertheless the silence of the early authors may be explained by the fact that if Irenaeus met his death in the general massacre of the Christians of Lyons under Septimius Severus his martyrdom would have attracted less notice than otherwise. In 1562 his remains were scattered by the Calvinists, and only his head has been refound.

II. THE WORKS OF SAINT IRENAEUS.

The extant works of Saint Irenaeus are as follows:

a). Two complete treatises; the *Proof*, and the writing *Against Heresies*, which will be dealt with below;

b). various fragments of other writings :

1. *On the Monarchy* or *How God is not the Cause of Evil*, writtern against Florinus, a former friend who had become a Gnostic.

2. *On the Ogdoad* (against the Ogdoad of Valentinus), addressee to Florinus.

3. *Treatise on Schism* (quarto-deciman), to Blastus, a friend of Florinus.

4. *Letter to Pope Victor*, on the Eastern question.

5. *On the Subject of Knowledge* (Περὶ ἐπιστήμης), a "short but necessary book", says Eusebius of this little apology to the Greeks. |

6. *Divers discourses* (treatises or perhaps homilies). It is possible that he was the author of the *Letter to the Churches* of Lyons and Vienne³ on the martyrs of 177. Other writings have been wrongly attributed to him, notably the four fragments published by Pfaff⁴, a Protestant professor at Tubingen in the 18th century. Pfaff himself fabricated these pieces.

The *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* 6, unlike the *Adversus Hæreses*, is not a controversial work, but a popular exposition of the faith and its proofs. It is a direct and summary presentation of Catholic doctrine. It is certainly brief, but as Vernet says, it is full of an extraordinary Christian feeling, at the same time simple, confident and profound. In some ways this work completes the *Adversus Hæreses*; but on the whole it unfolds the same ideas. Wo

¹ The majority are in *P. G.*, 7, 1225-1264, chiefly taken from Eusebius, *Him Eccl.*, V, 20-26.

² *Ibid.*, 26.

³ See J. Tixeront on this letter, *Milonga*, p. 44-73.

⁴ In 1713; to be found in *P. G.*, 7, 1248-1257.

⁵ Definitely established by Harnack, 1900.

⁶ *P. O.*, 12, col. 659-731 (French translation by J. Barthelemy and introduction by J. Tixeront, *ibid.*, 747-802). The work has been known only since 1907 (Edit. *Text. u. linters.*), after an ancient Armenian version. See F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, 2403-2410 (Editions and Studies).

"ill therefore insist moré especially on the latter work, which is more complete and covers a wider field.

I In *Adversus Hæreses* was originally meant to be very brief. Saint Irenæus had intended it to be but a short exposition of Valentinianism together with its refutation, to comply with the request of a friend. This first plan, however, gradually developed. After having described the *Valentinian systems* (of Valentinus himself, Ptolemy, his disciple, and Marcus, a Gallic Gnostic), Irenæus was led to make an inquiry into the *origins* of Gnosticism, from the Magus as far as Valentinianism, which latter is the culminating point of all past heresies, and also to give an account of the various derived sects. This is the subject of the first book; a simple exposition of error.

The second offers the philosophical and rational refutation. By means of subtle and at the same time vigorous logic, Saint Irenæus proves to the Gnostics that their system must lead them to two equally impossible explanations: Dualism or Pantheism.

Mor Freppel summarises his argument in the following dilemma: Either you separate God from the world, or you confuse *God* with the *World*; in both cases you destroy the true notion of God. *If you make Creation independent of God...* you limit the Divine Being, you circumscribe the sphere of His activity; which means that you deny Him... (As for the *Angels*) either they have acted against the will of the Supreme God or in obedience to Him. In the first hypothesis you make God of impotence, in the second you are led back, in spite of ourselves to Christian doctrine, which regards the Angels as the simple instruments of the Divine Will. You must therefore either admit the *Creation* or give up all hope of discovering the true God. *But if, on the contrary, you suppose the Creation to be in God*, in such a manner it is reduced to a mere development of His substance, you enter upon an even more thorny path. In this case all the imperfections and limitations of the creature fall back on God Himself, whose substance remains theirs. You say that the world is a fruit of ignorance and sin, the result of a flaw or a fall of the Pleroma, a gradual degeneration of being, or, as your favourite metaphor has it, a stain on God's light; but do you not realise that in this confusion of the infinite with the finite it is the Divine nature which falls, which degenerates, which is blamed with vice or imperfection? Is it possible to change the notion of God so grievously?" Such is the gist of the second book.

* [1] (i 7. 437-1224. See in particular F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, 2400-2403, and I Bibliography, 2407-2409. It may be noted that the book is sometimes entitled *Adversus Hæreses*, sometimes *Contra Hæreses*. It should not be confused with the Hippolytus' book, *Panarion*, cited as the *Hæreses* (See p. 398).

• A Didot, *op. cit.*, 5. *Irrefutabile* (Coll. *Pensée chrétienne*), p. 87.

But Saint Irenaeus does not stop short at negative destructive criticism. He crowns it with an exposition of the true doctrine, of which he constructs a *vast synthesis* in order to demonstrate its superiority over the Gnostic doctrines. This is the subject of *books III, IV, V*. They present the positive refutation of historical errors which are directly opposed to the teachings of the Scriptures. This new demonstration commences at the beginning of Book HI by a masterly explanation of considerable theological importance of the *Catholic rule of faith*. All these three books' are extremely rich in doctrine and have merited for Saint Irenaeus the title of *Father of Catholic theology*. But the order he adopted is not very clear. Instead of following the author step by step in each of these books, we will summarise his principal doctrines, classifying them logically in the following section.

Although the *Adversus Hæreses* has a number of shortcomings it is nevertheless remarkable for its great qualities. The author declares that being accustomed to speaking a barbarous tongue he is unable to write Greek elegantly. Indeed his simple and somewhat dull style is not polished. Often enough, however, his style becomes "animated and coloured, and sheds a happy thought in clear relief" Vernet quotes several fine expressions on God, on Christ, the love and the light, which show Saint Irenaeus to be a true disciple of Saint John I.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT IRENAEUS'.

Saint Irenaeus exercised a great doctrinal influence, A. Dufourcq sums it up in two words : he killed Gnosticism ; *he founded Christian theology* 3. As regards the first, Dufourcq compares the influence of the *Adversus Hæreses* to that of Bossuet's *History of the Variations*, against the Protestants. Evidently, Gnosticism was not immediately vanquished ! there were attempts at a recovery in the third and even in the fourth century. But the blows of Saint Irenaeus had been effective and the error was laid. The Bishop of Lyon» was one of the chief contributors to the triumph of the Church

1 F. Vernet, *Did. th.*, col. 2530-2531.

2 F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 2410-2507.

3 A. Dufourcq, *Saint Irénée*, (Les Saints), p. 169.

At the same time he founded Christian theology and based it solidly on Scripture and Tradition, establishing the rule of faith and placing his confidence in the "charisma of truth" which renders the Church indefectible. He was also the reminder of theology by his synthetic exposition of revealed truth found in the two works we have just analysed. His doctrine can be classed under five heads: 1) The rule of faith; 2) God and the Trinity; 3) Christ and the Redemption; 4) spiritual life; 5) the last ends.

1). The Rule of Faith. It is found in many passages of the two first books, and particularly in the first three chapters of book III. It may be summed up in the following propositions: 1) the exact interpretation of the Scriptures, which is the source of faith, requires a "*fixed rule of faith*" (κανὼν πύξ; ἀλήθεια ἀκλ'νή)†; this *rule of faith* is the baptismal *O'mbol*, or more exactly, Christian faith itself, expressed in the Creed and taught throughout the Church.

2) The duty of fixing the exact form of this symbol and of giving the true explanation of it properly belongs to the Church, which has received the Holy Ghost for the purpose of safeguarding and spreading religious truth without error: *Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi est Spiritus Dei et ubi Spiritus Dei, ibi est Ecclesia et omnis gratia : Spiritus autem veritas* 2.

3) The true teaching of the Church is that which is given by the *actual pastors*, who have received it from the apostles by way of uninterrupted tradition. It is that of the Mother-Churches who can show a catalogue of their bishops going back to the beginnings of Christianity. To sum up, the rule of faith is the present, living magisterium of the Church 3.

4) But since any enquiry into the teaching of all the Churches is beset with difficulty, there remains a last criterion of truth which is in reach of everybody and which is sufficient: the teaching of the Church of Rome 4. Here is the text of this important testimony:

" *Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus*

† *Adv. hier.*, I, IX, 4.

† *Adv. haeres.*, III, XXXIV. The Church possesses the charisma of truth (β'η' inna veritatis certum). *Ibid.*, IV, xxv, 2.

† *Ibid.*, III, III, 1.

† *Adv. hier.*, III, III, 2.

† Means "very ancient" and not "the most ancient",

cognita, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romafundata et constituta Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem et annuntiatam hominibus fidem, per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui, quoquo modo, vel per sibi placentia vel vanam gloriam, vel per cantatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. — Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentiores [potiores] principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his qui sunt undique¹ conservata est eaque quæ est ab apostolis traditio". Saint Irenæus then gives a list of the Bishops of Rome from Saint Peter to Saint Eleutherius, the head of the Church at that time A

It would seem that the last phrase, which is somewhat obscure⁴, need* to be translated thus : Indeed, it is with this Church, because of its great pre-eminence, that all Churches must agree, that is to say, all the faithful in the world, and it is in her (Roman Church, in qua) (by communion with her) that the faithful of all countries have conserved the Apostolic tradition s.

Others (Duchesne, Harnack, Funk) refer "in qua" to the Church scattered throughout the world; each Church in which (*in qua*) the Apostolic tradition is maintained must be in accord with Rome. Even translated in this manner, the phrase loses none of its value.

"It would be difficult", says Mgr. Duchesne⁶, "to find a clearer expression of:

1. the doctrinal unity of the universal Church;
2. the unique and sovereign importance of the Roman Church as the witness, guardian and organ of the Apostolic tradition ;
3. its superior pre-eminence in the whole of Christendom ",

B) Trinity. In his struggle against Gnosticism which made a distinction between a supreme God and a Demiurge Saint Irenæus was obliged to insist on the *unity of God*^A infinitely holy and perfect by His nature, creator of an ordered and harmonious world, since disorder does not derive from the author of nature?. This simplicity and unity of essence, however, does not exclude the *Trinity*. Saint

¹ According to the context it is an effective authority. See D. Chapman *Revue Binité*, xii (1895), p. 56.

- These repeated words have given rise to many hypotheses. Some critics suppress them, others only correct them. It is better to retain them as they stand ' *Adv. lit.*, II, li, 3.

* For the very many interpretations of this phrase, see F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, 2431-2438.

⁵ Bardenhewer, *Pat.*, I, p. 234.

• *Les Eglises sœurs*, p. 119.

⁷ See above, the analysis of the *Adv. har.*, bk. II.

ἐκ τῆς φύσεως does not employ this expression nor that of *economy* (οὐκ ἐκ τῆς οὐνοῦ), but he constantly names the three Persons and always places Them in the first rank. The plenitude of the divinity, everlastingly on the lips of the Gnostics, is expressed by the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost; God created everything through the Word and the Holy Ghost, but this Word and this Spirit are *one with God*.

The Son is truly God, engendered from all eternity. Certain expressions smacking of subordinationism have been pointed out in the Adv. Hær. (subordinating the Son to the Father), but in these places Saint Irenæus does little more than repeat expressions from the Gospels and Saint Paul. It is impossible to avoid a certain nominal subordinationism if the Father is admitted as the source of the Trinity². He takes the Holy Ghost truly distinct from the Son, although he sometimes gives the name of Spirit to the Son, or more often identifies the Spirit with the Wisdom of the sapiential books³, unlike the other Fathers of this period, with the exception of Theophilus.

I C). Christology. As it was for Saint Paul, Christology is the centre, the heart of all the theology of Saint Irenæus.

i) The principle of all his Christology is the doctrine of recapitulation (ἀνακεφαλαιώσεως) to which he was particularly attached. Essentially, man is neither good nor bad; he is free; and he sinned freely in Adam, his head. Jesus Christ is the new Adam, who recapitulates in Himself the whole of mankind and reconciles it with the Father!

He is able to do this because He is *God*, the Word, the Son of God. At the same time He is the Creator of mankind, and yet Himself a *man*. And our brother Jesus. In spite of his virginal birth (demonstrated at length by Irenæus), He has experienced the stages of man's life (age, trials, sorrows).

¹ See F. Vernet, *loc. cit.*, col. 2442-2446. This author says that in spite of Irenæus' inexact expressions "the Trinitarian doctrine of Irenæus is outstanding, more complete and more satisfying than that of his predecessors", (*Ibid.* 2242).

² In word *economy* was only applied to the Trinity by Tertullian, Hippolytus and Novatian.

³ In any case he affirms, not in so many words but equivalently, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. This is tantamount to the negation of subordinationism.

⁴ Adv. bar., III, X, 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III, XVI, 6; XVIII, I, 7; IV, præf., 2; XX, 8. See A. d'Alès, *La trinité de la récapitulation en Saint Irénée*, in *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, VI, (1916).

⁶ *Deumot.*, VI, XLIII; and Adv. haer. (*passim*).

Saint Irenaeus is aware of the *personal unity* of Christ amid the duality of His nature, and he shows this by his extensive use of the communication of idioms'. Moreover, it is necessary that Christ should be God in order to fulfil His mission in the world. Saint Irenaeus gives the name of οἰκονομία to the divine plan for the salvation of mankind¹³

2) Christ has a threefold mission: a) He is the *revealer*, the author of the fourth and the last Testament (the first three were given to Adam, to Noe and to Moses) ³; U) He is the *Redeemer*, who by His obedience during His life and in His violent death ⁴ makes expiation for our sins and vanquishes the devil; c) lastly, He is the *deifier*, the sanctifier who reconciliates us with God, makes us again in His image, makes us children of God, and, lastly, confers immortality and everlasting life upon us ⁵.

3) The fruits of the Redemption, which will only be perfect in the next life, are produced in this, especially by idly and operative faith^{6,7} by *baptism* (which is conferred! even on little children), and above all by the *Eucharist*, which is the body and blood of Jesus Christ into which the bread! and wine are changed ⁷. The ideas of Saint Irenaeus on this latter point are well brought out in a great number of texts. He considers the Eucharist not only as a Sacrament! but also as an oblation, a sacrifice, which renews the whole mystery of the Redemption ⁸.

¹ *Ipsum Verbum Dei incarnatum suspensum est super lignum.* See *Adv. haer.* I, XVIII, 1. The expression. *Commixtio et communio Dei et hominis*, under which he has been reproached (*ibid.*, IV, xx, 4), does not signify the union of the Word and humanity, but the union of God and man in Christ.

³ *Demonst.*, vi, x l v iii. *Adv. haer.*, I, X, 1, 3; III, XVI, 6, 8; xvn, 1, 4; *eli.*

³ *Adv. haer.*, III, Xi, 8; IV, IX, 3; XII, 2, 5; xm, 2.

* His soteriological doctrine unites the (realist) theory of satisfaction to the (mystical) theory of union (see p. 352 below); it is extremely rich in doctrinal As for the so-called theory of the rights of the devil which has been ascribed to Saint Irenaeus (J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, Paris, 1905, p. 377), it can hardly be attributed to him unless one lays exaggerated stress on some of his expressions. There can be no question of strict rights: in the Redemption, the justice which regards the devil is directed against, rather than for, the devil, and comes from the divine wisdom. That man should take revenge on the tempter is in perfect keeping with this Wisdom. J. Rivière, *Bull. d'anc. lit., et arch. chrét.*, I, (1911), 169-200, and P. Galati, *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, il (1911), 1-24. See also *Ibid.*, in-v (1912-1914).

⁵ *Adv. haer.*, III, XVIII, XIX, XXIII; V, I, 1; XII, 6; xiv, I, 3; etc.

" *Credere autem ei est facere ejus voluntatem.* *Adv. haer.*, IV, VI, 5.

⁷ For the Eucharistic doctrine of Saint Irenaeus see A. d'Alès in *Rech.*

Λ./., χπτ (1923), p. 24-46.

• *Adv. haer.*, IV, XVII, 5; xv iii, I, 4.

1 Mariology. The doctrine of Mary's share in the work of Redemption, first developed by Saint Justin, was continued and completed by Saint Irenaeus. After having, like Saint Paul, made a parallel between Adam and Jesus Christ, Irenaeus opposes the reparative action of the second Eve, Mary, to the death-bringing work of the first; "Mary loosened the knots formed by the fault of Eve. The one resisted the commands of God, the other submitted to them. Eve listened to the voice of the Devil, Mary gave heed to the voice of the Angel. The human race, sent to its death by a virgin, has been saved by another virgin" 2; for Mary, "by her obedience, was the *cause of salvation* for Eve and for all mankind. It is through her obedience that "the virgin Mary became the *advocate* of the virgin Eve" 2*. "This term, *Advocate*, does not mean Mary's intercessory power in heaven, but signifies that Mary came to the help of Eve and her race" 3. Moreover, although Saint Irenaeus does not employ the words, Mother of God, he affirms Mary's divine maternity; he had an admirable insight into the *harmony* which exists between this privilege and the mission of Christ 4. Finally, together with Saint Justin and Saint Ignatius, Saint Irenaeus asserted the perpetual virginity of Mary; recently this has been unjustifiably denied 5.

2 I). Christian spirituality 6. Saint Irenaeus opposed a Christian conception of spirituality to the false Gnostic dualism; as in the teaching of Saint Paul, the *Holy Ghost* occupies a large place. The Spirit is shown as a constitutive element of the perfect man; the latter, besides his soul and body, possesses the Spirit, a gift of God, in which must be recognised at the same time the created gift of grace made to the human person, and also the person of the Giver, Who

1 *Adv. haer.*, HI, xxn, 3, 4.

2 *Adv. haer.*, V, XIX, I.

3 Neubert, *Marie dans l'Eglise anténicéenne*, p. 263-264.

4 G. Galtier, *La Vierge qui nous refit*, in *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, V (1914) p. 136-145.

5 Herzig, in *Rev. d'hist. et Utt. relig.*, xii (1907), p. 484. wrongly based his argument on the following text: *Filius Dei filius hominis purus pure puram per virginem* (*Adv. haer.*, IV, XXIII, 11), which proves, on the contrary, the supernatural manner of Our Lord's birth. See F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 2484-2485.

6 For the whole of this paragraph see the fine article of A. M.-J. in *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, 1924 (t. xiv), p. 497-538, on *La doctrine de l'Esprit en Saint Irénée*. See F. Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 2452 sq., 2487 sq.

is inseparable from the gift . These precise expressions, which are due to later theologians are implied by the vehement words of Saint Irenaeus. Thus, in the perfect man may be found, besides the three elements, *body, soul and spirit*, an intimate union with the Holy Ghost.

The part played by the Holy Ghost is to give back to man the resemblance to God and to the Son, which was lost, by sin. No doubt man is *free* and can hinder this action, as did Adam. But man alone can do nothing to make himself like to God. "Not only the initiative belongs to God but also all the work", says A. d'Alès¹ "Man has but to make himself as clay in the hands of the potter. All he can do of himself is to resist and tear himself away from the imprints of the Divine hand. But by submission, on the contrary, he will become the masterpiece that God would make of him.] In man's docility to the Divine Spirit lies the reconciliation! between grace and merit³. The perseverance of man is itself a gift of God. It is a free gift, but man may obtain it for himself through constant submission to God"⁴. It is evident that *prayer* enters for a great deal into such spirituality s. ;

The perfection of man, which begins with the first effusion of the Holy Ghost and which is perfectly *consummated* only in heaven, is truly found here below in the harmonious unity of the three elements, when man cleaves to the Holy Ghost and is docile to His inspirations⁶. Again, even in this world, the life of the Spirit should be manifested in *effects of an intellectual character*. The Christian who is formed at the school of the Holy Ghost is able to *judge of all things* ⁷. He is able to discern the foolishness of the Pagans and the heretics. He will cleave with his whole soul to God, to Jesus Christ and His Church. He will recognise the realisation of the prophecies, suggested by the Spirit, in the life of the Incarnate Word, and he will perceive the working of the Spirit in the present generation, which is still to be won over to the Word.

¹ In the whole of the *Adv. haer.*, V, VI, Spirit means the *Spirit of God* considered in man, as in *Rom.*, viii, 16. See A. d'Alès, *of. cit.*, 504-506.

³ *Of. cit.*, p. 533.

⁴ *Adv. glâr.*, IV, xxxix, 2; V, IX, 3.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, XXXVIII, 3.

⁵ *Ibid.*, IV, XX, li; V, XVII, I.

• *Adv. Aar.*, V, VI.

⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, XXXIII.

The last things ■ The Eschatology of Saint Irenaeus, remarks I. Vernet, is “a mixture of interesting ideas, of affirmations containing the substance of the Church’s teaching, and of contestable or even wholly erroneous theories. It is the weakest part of his work. He maintained the opinion, now heretical, of the *postponement of the Beatific Vision* until the General Judgment. He also believed that Christ would remain on earth for a thousand years in this world, with the just arisen from the grave. He derived this *millenarianism* from Papias and the presbyters, and used it as an arm against Gnosticism. He defended it by saying that man must be led little by little, through a process of “gradual” teaching, to the vision of God. It was also a consequence of his doctrine of recapitulation.

CHAPTER VII.

Divers Secondary Writings.

I. VARIOUS LETTERS.

I. Saint Dionysius of Corinth was the object of great veneration about the years 160-170, as is proved by the seven letters which he sent to various Churches in answer to their requests for advice. The subjects of these letters are to be found in Eusebius. He also wrote a letter to Pope, *Saint Soter* (166-174), in reply to a letter of the latter, now no longer extant. This letter was read on Sundays to the assembled community, as was also read, Saint Dionysius tells us, the letter which he had once written to Corinth.

Serapion of Antioch, bishop of that town from 191 to 212, the second successor of Saint Theophilus, is also mentioned by Eusebius. He is the author of several lost treatises and various letters.

Polyrates, bishop of Ephesus, is best known for his opposition to Pope Victor during the *Easter controversy*. He wrote, in particular, a letter on this subject, in the name of the Synod of Asia, of which it was phrases are quoted by Eusebius. Eusebius also mentions other letters written on the same occasion.

Saint Victor, Pope (189-199), is chiefly famous for the part that he also took in the controversy, and notably for having asked for Councils to be held throughout the Church; these Councils subsequently

¹ I. Vernet, *op. cit.*, col. 2498-2507.

² *Ibid.*, 2507.

tandem aliquando maturus fiat homo, in tantis maturescens ad videndum Deum. Adv. har., IV, xxxvii, 7.

³ Routh, *Reliquia sacra*, 2nd ed., i, 175-201. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv, 23.

⁴ G., 5, 1373-1376. See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vi, 12.

⁵ *Ibid.* (51357-1362. See Eusebius, *ibid.*, v, 24.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1483-1490. See Eusebius, *ibid.*, v, 23-25.

took place and for the most part were favourable to the Roman tradition. He himself wrote many *letters* mentioned by Eusebius. Saint Jeromo I would have it that he was the author of several treatises and was the fu I Latin ecclesiastical writer'; but these treatises are lost. The *De AliaA foribus* attributed to him by Harnack, is posterior to Saint Cyprian', I

II. THE EPITAPHS OF ABERCIUS AND PECTORIUS'. I

A). Abercius is known to us by a *Life*, which is to be found in ilio· Greek Passionaries (22 Oct.), and by an *Epitaph*. The Life appearjM to be but an amplification of the Epitaph, of which it gives the text, in· a somewhat corrupt condition. Two fragments of the Epitaph wi n· I found by Ramsay in 1883 in Asia Minor (at Hierapolis of Phrygia· Salutaris, not Hierapolis in Phrygia Pacatiensis). These fragments air ■ now in the Lateran Galleries. The rationalists have vainly tried lui deny the Christian character of this work, but they have been succès»· fully refuted by first-class scholars such as de Rossi, Zahn, Duchesne· Cumont.

This Epitaph informs us, first, regarding the life of Abercius, wlmI composed the Epitaph himself. He was Bishop of Hierapolis, and I probably the Phrygian anti-Montanist writing we already have had· occasion to mention was addressed to him. In a mystical and meta· phorical style he gives an account of a journey he made to Rome, and· from there to Syria as far as Nisibis, visiting the Christian Churches. I

He introduces himself thus: "My name is Abercius, tlm disciple of a holy shepherd, who feeds flocks of sheep on mountains and in plains, who has great eyes that see everyJ where. It was he who taught me the book worthy of belief"! The rest of this document, which is the most important of all' Christian epitaphs, is of capital interest to theological science!

1). on the *Roman Primacy*: "For he (the shepherd) sent me to Rome to contemplate majesty, and to see a queeeil golden-robed and golden-sandalled; there also I saw a people bearing a shining mark" (baptism);

2). on the *Eucharist*: "Faith everywhere led me forward,! and everywhere provided as my food a *fish* of exceeding great size and perfect, which a holy virgin (Mary) drew with her hand from a fountain... and this (faith) ever gives to her friends to eat, it having *wine* of great virtue, and giving il mingled with *bread*". "Thus", says Salomon Reinach, "the Primacy of the Roman See, the symbolism of tini

1 *De Viris*, 53.

2 *Texte u. Unters.* v, i (Leipzig), 1888.

3 See A; d'Ar.Ès, in the *Etudes*, 1905 (t. 104), p. 291-317.

4 H. Leclercq, *Abercius*, in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 66-87.

5 H. Leclercq, *Autun (Archéologie)*, *ibid.*, col. 3194-3198.

|| h. Baptism and the Eucharist were all attested by the Epitaph of Abercius in the middle of the second century", And, as he pertinently observes, until Ficker (1894), all those vIn) had studied the text, whether Catholics, Protestants h i Jews, had subscribed to this explanation. No recent nil μ uvery has been made capable of detracting from its ■ahie.

■ Ill Another Greek Epitaph, discovered at Autun in 1839, maybe ■lu .ed with this gem of Christian Epigraphy. This is the Epitaph of W6 tonus, which was first studied by the future Cardinal Pitra and then Hiy i ;reat number of other scholars. Its date is unfortunately much less Britain than that of Abercius, but it is very probable that it dates from ■In end of the second century. It is composed in a style greatly St u mbiing the Phrygian inscription, and besides theXOTS (acrostically inni in the text) it contains a testimony to Eucharistic Communion under ||< two kinds and its reception in the hands, as well as a prayer for the l. The interpretation given to it by the erudite has been diversely Influenced by the theological importance of these texts.

HI. THE CANON OF MURATORI.

I This name is given to the oldest extant *Canon* of the New B'<-itament. A *canon* is an official catalogue of the Books which the Church regards as inspired. It will be easily llinlerstood that such catalogues of the New Testament were lbiit gradually drawn up at the beginning of the Church, rilic inspired works were all written for some special purpose lm on some particular occasion, and were not immediately In.i sed round from one Christian community to another. [When the Church had made certain of their Apostolic origin lm of their approbation by the Apostles, she guaranteed the ■liuracter of their divine inspiration and inscribed them in lin i canon. The proof that such a canon existed is found in the writings of the Fathers of this period. But there is more than that; in 1740, *L. A. Muratori* (d. 1750), librarian Ini the Ambrosian Library, discovered and published the liilmost entire text of a Canon of the Roman Church dating III·un the end of the second century, which he found in a ■tumuscript of the 6th-8th century (full of spelling faults). ||n spite of its poor literary quality, this document is of the liltniost importance.

|| The entire text may be found in Rouet de Journal, *Enchiridion Patria.*, l. 105107. Corrections are suggested in the notes. See the Introductions to lm New Testament.

According to this text, the *Roman Church* recognised as inspired 1) The *four Gospels* (the beginning of the canon is missing in tin-manuscript, but as the Gospel of Saint Luke is mentioned as being tin-third, we can suppose that the existence of the two others was also recognised); 2) The *Acts of the Apostles*; 3) The thirteen first *Epistles of Saint Paul*; two Epistles, to the *Laodiceans* and to the *Alexandrians*, which had been attributed to him, are here rejected (there is no question of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* unless this is meant by the title, *Epistle to the Alexandrians*); 4) The *Epistle of Saint Jude* and two Epistle» of *Saint John* (there is no allusion to the Epistles of *Saint James* and *Saint. Peter*); 5) The *Apocalypse* of John, and probably that of Peter (apocryphal) although the latter, recognised in Rome, was rejected by several of the Churches; 6) The *Pastor*, recently composed (*nuperrime*) by Hernias, during the pontificate of Pius, his brother, may be read in public, but must not be assimilated to the writings of the prophets and the Apostles; 7) Not one of the writings of Arsinoe, Valentinus on Miltiades is admitted in the canon.

The reference to Hermas places the date of composition after 155-156 (date of the death of Pius I). Those who insist! on *nuperrime* put it very near to this date, while others piaci; it as late as 200. Father Lagrange is of the latter opinion and considers that the account which is given of Saint John shows that the compilers were concerned with refuting the thesis of Caius of Rome '. (See *above*, ch. V, p. 139).

CHAPTER VIII.

Christian Apocryphal Literature.

I. APOCRYPHAL LITERATURE IN GENERAL'.

The name of Apocryphal in contradistinction to *Canonicità* is given to those books which either give themselves out tu; be *inspired*, or have been so regarded by certain ecclesiastical authors, but which, finally, have been withdrawn from tins

* M. J. Lagrange, *Evang. scion SaintJean*, Introduction p. lxi-lxv. i

3 E. Amann, *Les Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament*, in *Did. Jildà* (Supplement) col. 460 and. sq. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte...* 1, 365*480 E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apocryphen...*, Tübingen, 1904 (2nd ed. 1924)1 *Handbuch zu den N. T. Apocryphen*, 1904. J. Bousquet and E. Amann *Les Apocryphes du Nouveau Testament*, a collection in which many importmij works have already appeared; Introduction, texts, translation, commentane. In the collection, *Textes et Documents*, see *Evangiles apocryphes*. Various apN cryphal writings (Coptic, Syriac...) have been published by the *Revue de l'OrieJ chrétien* and by the *Patrologia Orientalis*.

union of the Scriptures. Apocryphal (ἀπόκρυφο, hidden) therefore the precise technical sense of *non-canonical*, which is usually added a depreciatory concept which imposes the work to be regarded as legendary, fantastic and of doubtful value. An acquaintance with these writings is nevertheless useful either for the refutation of unbelievers who make false use of them, or for the purpose of seizing the grains of historical or doctrinal truth lying behind their fictions, and especially for the information they furnish aiding the intellectual, religious and moral character of their authors.

They purport to complete the data of the biblical writings of the Old or the New Testament, by adding to the accounts contained in them, or by supplying information which they omit. The *Christian* apocryphal literature, that is to say imposed by Christians, is chiefly concerned with the *New Testament*. There are, however, certain exceptions: besides Christian interpolations in Old Testament apocrypha and various Gnostic compositions, the famous *Odes of Solomon*, published for the first time in 1909, must be mentioned; but on the whole, the Christian Apocrypha are connected with the *New Testament*. They are usually classed under *heads* according to their literary form: 1) The Gospels; 2) the Acts; 3) the Epistles; 4) the Apocalypses.

* The *Odes of Solomon*, distinct from the *Psalms of Solomon* known in 1626, were discovered in 1905 in a Syriac manuscript by Rendel Harris, published them at Cambridge in 1909. A new edition was published, with an introduction by M. R. Harris and A. Mingana, 1916-20. In 1920 J. Labourt and P. Batiffol have also published a translation, with historical introduction and commentary. This work, which was known by the influence of Lactantius and a quotation in a 3rd cent. Gnostic writing, had been for a long time lost. It consists of 42 odes, which appear to have been written by but one author, in Greek or more probably in Syriac; in the district of Antioch, rather than in Asia Minor or in Egypt, on account of their Targumite character, says Fr. Lagrange (*Introduction to his Evangile syrien*). These odes are the hymn of thanksgiving of the soul which God has led to redemption and salvation. They are remarkable "for their original freshness of inspiration and religious fervour", says J. Labourt (p. 1). The author is a Christian who expresses his ideas and his feelings through the figure of Solomon, a fictitious personage, who represents, turn and turn about, the saint in heaven, and Christ Himself. Although Christ is alluded to in evidence in these songs, the author's Christianity is somewhat nebulous; he quotes the name of Jesus, neither does he speak of baptism, nor of the Eucharist and the hierarchy. The lyrical nature of the work does not explain all these omissions. The author is inspired by the Gospel of Saint Matthew but never cites him. He may also have been acquainted with the Epistles of Ignatius. His work is usually dated from 100-120. There is no proof it was a Judæo-Christian.

Two very different groups may be distinguished according to the purpose intended by the authors: «) the first, of *heretical* origin, especially Gnostic, were destined to spread among the people, a heretical teaching which was placed in the mouths of Jesus Christ and the Apostles; b~) the others, deriving from an orthodox source, were meant for the edification of the faithful: they were pious inventions, both poetical and legendary, written to satisfy the curiosity of the Christians who were much more preoccupied with knowing! what the sacred text did not say than with a close study of its teaching.

They are all noteworthy: a) for the *poverty of their doctrine*, both from a moral and dogmatic point of view;

b~) for the *improbable nature of the characters* who move in an unreal and fantastic world of their own, and the singular and even extravagant stories in which extraordinary and even puerile miracles are profusely strewn;

c) for the *fluctuation of the text* which was for ever being retouched, thus rendering it very difficult to determine the age and the source of these writings.

Compared with the canonical works, all these writings are notably inferior. Renan himself says that "it would be an insult to Christian literature to rank these dull compositions with the masterpieces of Mark, Luke and Matthew". The apocryphal gospels do no more than embroider a given canvas, but they are full of "the tiring verbosity of an old gossip, the basely familiar tone of literature fit for nursemaids and the servants' quarters"*. No need to wonder then, that these works usually filled the Fathers with repulsion and that they did all they could to warn the faithful against them, especially as they were often misused by the heretics. The Church was unable, however, to eliminate them altogether, The bishops themselves endeavoured to expurgate rather than suppress them. They thought that by removing everything that was doubtful, and which they regarded as deriving from heretical alterations, they would be able to discover an orthodox basis of primitive traditions. They were thus led to believe that everything that was not contrary to faith was historically true.

* *L'Eglise c/nçtienne*, 1879, p. 505 sq.

The influence which was exercised by these expurgated mid constantly retouched works lasted for centuries. It was (specially felt during the Middle Ages. Traces of them are to be found in popular preaching (see the collections of Simons), in the *hagiography* (witness the *Légende Dorée* of Jacques de Voragine), in *poetry* (the *Divine Comedy* has borrowed a great deal of its eschatological inventions from the old apocalypses), and lastly in *art* (for instance, in the paintings of Renaissance artists representing the life of Mary, or the images of the Apostles, or the sculptures of the Last Judgment to be seen in the cathedrals).

In the East also, apocryphal literature was reproduced in translations, amplifications and new versions in every tongue, Arabic, Syriac, Greek, Slavonic, etc., and its influence was as powerful as in the West. It is therefore extremely useful to know something of its sources. They are still very obscure and we will do no more than indicate them summarily in this place.

II. APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS*.

They may be classed under three heads: 1) the *lost* Gospels; 2) the Gospels of the Saviour's *Childhood*; 3) the Gospels of the *death* of Christ or of Our Lady.

I A). The lost Gospels, certain of which are of great interest

I i). Gospel of the Hebrews, or *according to the Hebrews*, is chiefly known by the words of Saint Jerome: "Chaldaico quidem Syroque «■linone (Aramaic) sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est". The original as well as Saint Jerome's translation of it is lost. Although it was not altogether identical with the original Aramaic of Saint Matthew, it followed its main outlines and many of its details, and completed it in many places. It was the favourite Gospel of the orthodox group (Nazarenes) of the Judæo-Christians. It dates from the end of the first, or the beginning of the second century.

The Gospel of the Ebionites (heretics) has sometimes been identified with the Gospel of the Hebrews, mentioned above, retouched and altered so as to bear a heretical interpretation. Present day critics prefer to make a complete distinction and identify it with the *Gospel of*

I * Amann, *op. cit.* col. 465-468.

editions: C. Tischendorf, *Evangelia apocrypha* Leipzig, 1853 (2nd ed., 1875); Coll. *Textes et Documents: Evangiles apocryphes* t. I, by Cu. Michel (1911); t. U, by P. PETERS (1914).

I * Sue M. J. Lagrange, *ICEvangile selon les Hébreux*, in the *Revue biblique* (1900), p. 161-181, 321-349.

the Twelve, a misleading compilation of the canonical Gospels composed in the 2nd century *.

3). The *Gospel according to the Egyptians* is a heretical work of the 2nd century in which, it is believed, were taught a) Encratism concerning detuning marriage; b) Unitarianism, a negation of the Trinity, similar to the error proposed by Sabellius; c) metempsychosis.

4). The *Gospel of Barnabas*, rejected by the decree of Gelasius¹. I

5). The *Gospel of Bartholomew*, id.
(various fragments have been discovered).

6). The *Gospel of Thaddaeus*, id.

7). The *Gospel of Judas Iscariot*, was that of the Cainite Gnostics. I

8). The *Gospel of Mathias* (3rd century Gnostic) is the same as the "*Traditions of Mathias*"

9). The *Gospel of Philip* (Gnostic) probably of Egyptian origin. I

10). The *Gospel of Thomas* (Gnostic, 2nd century). Another version of this writing was discovered in the "*Account of Thomas the Israelite philosopher, of the Infancy of the Lord*", known under the title of "*Gospel of Thomas the Israelite*" (see below: Gospels of the Infancy).

B) Gospels of the Infancy. 1). Among the so-called Gospels of the Infancy may be classed the Protoevangelium Jacobi or *Infancy Gospel of James*³, which is perhaps the most remarkable of all the Apocrypha. The wide diffusion and the great influence enjoyed by this writing were due both to its simple and serious tone, and its really pious character. The 24 chapters of which it is composed may be divided into three parts, which in all probability were originally three separate documents, a). *Chapters 1-16* relate the miraculous birth of Mary, which was supernaturally announced to Joachim and Anna; her dedication to the service of the Temple and her marriage to Saint Joseph. This part was written between 130 and 140. b). *In chapters 17-21* Saint Joseph himself is made to relate the birth of Jesus and the Adoration of the Wise Men; hence the name, *Apocryphum Josephi*, applied to these chapters (2nd cent.), c). *Chapters 22-24* contain an account of the slaughter of the Holy Innocents and the murder of Zacharias. These are termed the *Apocryphum Zachariae* (the main outlines date from the 2nd century). The Greek version at present extant would

¹ A number of recent critics distinguish three Judaeo-Christian Gospels, cf. Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 473-475.

³ This and the following Gospels are included in the class of *sectary* (iospela) see Amann, *op. cit.*

³ The only grounds for this title of *Protoevangelium* is that it was given to the work by Postel, the first editor of the work, in the sixteenth century.

in. appear to be anterior to the fourth century. The Judæo-luistian author purports to be James, the Bishop of Jeru-ktilein. The unity of this work becomes more obvious if the hii'l part is regarded as an addition. The purpose of Jnilying Mary and her purity, confided to the care of Saint h . ph, should be remarked. Only the later versions of the h'otoevangelium were know in the West (see below 3).

2) The Gospels of the Childhood properly so-called are many ni various. The *Gospel of Thomas the Israelite* and the *Arabic Gospel* r the better known. Until recent times the latter was supposed to be mved from the former; but it would probably be more exact to say .it they both derive from an extremely variegated common source, mtaining even Buddhist fables, and which was the starting point of all t legendary literature concerning the childhood of Jesus'. These nls are of but little worth. The dullness of the style and the poverty expression are in keeping with the triviality of the matter.

.l The Gospel of Thomas the Israelite purports to give an Count of the miracles which Jesus performed between the age of 5 and years, and it shows in particular that He punished those who refused believe in Him, by blindness and death. It terminates with the Inode of Jesus among the doctors. A very odious character is given the child in this work; several parts of it, although expurgated, viously originated in heretical circles.

1). The Arabic Gospel of the Infancy (so called because for a long H it was extant only in that tongue) is a fairly complete history of the ildhood of the Saviour. It bases its account of the birth of Jesus ll tin- flight into Egypt on the Protoevangelium (ch. 1-9); the following Upters, however, are original (10-35) and te'l the life of the Holy .inily in Egypt where the Child worked a number of extraordinary i.u les. The final chapters (36-55) are very similar to the Gospel of lumas. "The important place given to the Virgin Mary, who in in case is the mediatrix of the favours vouchsafed by the divine lbi should be noted'.

Inm or from accounts of the Infancy:

ll The *Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew* or Book of the Birth of limed Mary and the Infancy of the Saviour, a trivial and occa-lially gross book, is probably a 6th century compilation. It is lmi. cd of two parts, of which the contents are sufficiently indicated lll>- title.

) The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary is a good revision of the lu-t work, and dates probably from the Carlovingian period. It L only with Mary, whose birth, youth and marriage it describes in Interesting way. It finishes with an account of the birth of Jesus

Hu the Introduction to *Evangelies apocryphes* (Coll. *Testes et Documents*),

À MANN. *op. cit.*, col. 485.

based on the Synoptics. It is chiefly through this writing that the *Protoevangelium* and particularly the dedication of Mary to the Temple became known in the West.

C). The deaths of Jesus, Mary and Joseph have also been a source of inspiration to the authors of the pseudo-canonical Gospels. 1

1). Those which concern the death of the Saviour may be classed under the name of *Chronicle of Pilate*, having as a common source the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the *Gospel of Peter*.

a). The Gospel of Nicodemus consists of two parts: the first, which is called the *Acts of Pilate* (1-16), is a kind of report of the trial of Our Lord before Pilate, and His ensuing death (i-ii), and of the debate held by the Sanhedrim after the Resurrection (12-16). The purpose of this book was to prove that Pilate himself was aware of the innocence of Jesus and that the Sanhedrim was obliged to admit the truth of the Resurrection. It is possible that the Acts of Pilate date from the second century. The *second part* is entitled *The Descent of Christ into Hell* (ch. 17-27) because an account of this descent is given by two supposed eyewitnesses who rose from the dead at the death of Jesus.

b). The Gospel of Peter is the work of a Docetist, also of the second century. A part of it was recently discovered in 1886. It contains a great many details of the Passion, the Crucifixion and the Resurrection of Our Lord. This work is connected on many points with the foregoing (See Semeria, *Revue Biblique*, 1894, p. 522-560). 1

2). The Falling Asleep of Mary (Κοιμησι τῇ ἀγία Θεοτοκου), || Latin the *Transitus Sancte Maria* (according to the *Decretum of Gelasius* which states it to be apocryphal), appears to be a Greek work of the fourth or fifth century, the subject of much recasting. One version attributed to Melito of Sardis in the second century, which certainly composed at a much later date. In the extant manuscripts this document purports to be a discourse of Saint John on the death of the Blessed Virgin. Mary, having heard from the Angel Gabriel that she was soon to leave the world, retired to Bethlehem where she was joined by the Apostles. She comes back to Jerusalem where she dies in the midst of extraordinary prodigies. She is buried by the Apostles and three days later her body is carried into heaven by the angels. This writing, which exercised a great influence both in the East and in the West, is altogether orthodox and cannot be regarded as a Catholic recast of a heretical writing.

3). History of Joseph the Carpenter (extant only in Coptic and Arabic) is of Egyptian origin of the fourth, or perhaps fifth, century. It is in the form of a conversation between Jesus and the Apostles, and relates (according to the *Protoevangelium*) the life, and especially the death, of Saint Joseph. There lies the interest of the work. The idea given in the latter part, is worth mentioning: "the crossing which the soul must accomplish after having left the body; guided by Saint

1 In any case "older and more qualified witnesses than these imaginative writings have borne testimony to the taking of Mary into heaven", renami M. Jugie in the *Echos d'Orient*, 1926, p. 15 (article on *La Mort et l'Assomption de Marie dans la tradition des cinq premiers siècles*).

Mu liael, it is able to pass over the sea of fire which confronts every
 nul after death". The author makes no reference to the Assumption
 nl Mary. According to this account the body of Saint Joseph is to
 h main intact until the thousand year reign of Christ.

III. APOCRYPHAL ACTS'.

l Both the orthodox and the heretical writers of spurious documents
 m.'k' inspired in a greater measure by the lives and preaching of the
 kpostles than by that of Our Lord. We are acquainted with Apocryphal
 Art. on nine of the Apostles, and it is very possible that the others
 « me not forgotten.

i Saint Peter. a). The *Preaching of Peter*, mentioned by
 climient of Alexandria, was probably a series of instructions embodied
 hi an account of the Apostolic journeys. Nothing goes to prove that
 Ih . was a heretical writing, in spite of the fact that the Clementine
 liliature with Judaizing tendencies found its inspiration therein.
 Ij The *Acts of Peter* are also lost, except two fragments, of which
 nu- is the *Martyrium B. Petri apostoli a Lino episcopo conscriptum*; the
 Bllier, *Actus Petri in Simone*, relates the fall of Simon, the "Quo Vadis",
 lliil the crucifixion of Peter with his head to the ground. This fabri-
 bntion does not seem to have been heretical. It probably dates from
 llir second century.

Saint Paul. a). A *Preaching of* is very little known.

l h). The *Acts of Saint Paul*,* on the contrary, became famous.
 [Tu- original text was composed of three parts: the "Martyrdom of
 Miiiit Paul", the "Correspondence (apocryphal) of Saint Paul with
 Ih Corinthians", and the "Acts of Paul and Thecla". These were
 lip.iated later. They were composed in the second century by an
 R.iatic priest, who was disgraced as a punishment for this fabrication,
 Blthough his work was orthodox.

l). The *Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul* (3rd cent.) gives
 In nk count of their common labours in Rome and their martyrdom.

l Saint Andrew. The *Acts of Andrews* (2nd cent.) are no longer
 ■l.mt, except for three episodes (Andrew and Matthew in the town of
 lb- iannibals, the Acts of Peter and Andrew, and Saint Andrew's
 hliiylrdom in Achaia) which have been subject to frequent recasting.
 Il i probable that only the Martyrium is original.

I . Saint John. The *Acts of John* (2nd cent.), which are also lost,
 lin. been partly reconstituted by means of quotations and various

* Mann, *op. cit.*, col. 484.

• Editions: R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*,
 Hl , 3 vol., 1891, 1896, 1903. Studies: R. A. LIPStus, *Die Apocryphen*
 feimtijschichten und Apostellegenden, Brunswick, 1883-90 (2 vol.).

• l Vouaux, *Les Actes de Pierre*, Paris, 1922 (Coll. *Apocr. N. Test.*).

l AM10N, *Les Actes Apocryphes de Pierre* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1908-11.

• l Vouaux, *Zrr Ades de Paul et les lettres apocryphes*, Paris, 1913 (Coll.
 fr. ' N. Test.).

• l l camion, *Les Ades apocryphes d'Andri*, Louvain, 1911.

orthodox versions of the original heretical writing. They relate the exile in Patmos, the second stay in Ephesus, and Saint John's peaceful death in that town.

5). Saint Thomas. The *Acts of Thomas* (3rd cent.) are Gnostic with a strong Encratite tendency. They have been well conserved at least the two later Syriac and Greek versions. They deal with the Saint's labours in India and are nothing but a tissue of strange miracles.

6). Saint Philip. The *Acts of Philip* (probably 4th cent.) give an account of the missionary work of Saint Philip the Apostle who is confused with Philip the Deacon (the book is filled with similar errors). According to this work, the Saint took the Gospel to Greece, Palestine and Ethiopia. The writing contains fifteen Acts.

7). Saint Thaddeus. The *Acts of Thaddeus*, one of the seven! two disciples, which tell of the famous correspondence of Jesus with Abgar, King of Edessa (cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 13; II, I, 6) appear to have been written in Syriac in the third century. They are still called the *Acta Edessena*. The Syriac version published in 1871 entitled the *Teaching of Addai*, is a later composition (390-430 circa). A fifth century Greek version identifies the disciple Thaddeus (or Addai) with the Apostle Thaddeus (or Lebbaeus).

The following may also be mentioned: 1). the *Martyrium of Arin Matthew*, who died at Myra among the cannibals (see the *Acts of Andrew*); 2). the *Passion of Bartholomew*, in India; 3). The *Acts of Barnabas*, who died in Cyprus after many Apostolic labours. These documents are of later composition (4th or 5th century).

IV. APOCRYPHAL LETTERS AND APOCALYPSES. I

A). All the APOCRYPHAL LETTERS are attributed to *Paul*, with the exception of a *Letter of the Apostles*, recently discovered which dates from the second century.

1). The Epistle to the Laodiceans owes its origin to that passage in the canonical Epistle to the Corinthians (IV, 16) in which Saint Paul speaks of a letter he had sent to the Laodiceans. This letter is clumsily fabricated with extracts from the canonical Epistles. It should probably be distinguished from that mentioned in the Canon of Muratori.

2). The *Epistle to the Alexandrians*, mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment, was forged by followers of Marcion and is now lost.

3). The Correspondence of Saint Paul with the Corinthians contains a letter from the Corinthians in which Gnosticism is denounced and an answer from the Apostle (cf. *Ep. to the Cor.*) in confirmation of his teaching. The document was incorporated in the "Acts of Paul" (2nd cent.).

4). The Correspondence of Saint Paul and Seneca consists of 11 letters from the philosopher Annaeus Seneca to Saint Paul, and 1

1 R. Duval, *La littérature syriaque* (1900), p. 102-118. J. Tixeront, *origines de l'Eglise d'Edesse et la légende d'Abgar*, Paris, 1888.

2 L. Voisard, *Les Actes de Saint Paul et ses lettres apocryphes*, Paris, 191

answers from the latter. The philosopher expresses his admiration for the Apostle's doctrine, but regrets the literary shortcomings of his writing. The author of this forgery probably intended to introduce an intellectual work to polite Roman society. These documents, which are both unintelligent and lacking in style, must date from the fourth century. Certain critics, however, make the date of composition as late as the tenth or eleventh century.

I. The principal *Apocalypses* are those of Peter and Paul.

I. The Apocalypse of Peter, which deals with the Last Judgment and describes the happiness of heaven and the terrors of hell, is a somewhat remarkable work of the second century. It has enjoyed considerable authority. It was commented by Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian Fragment thought it inspired.

I. An "*Apocalypse of Peter by Clement*" in Ethiopia dates from the fifth century.

I. The Apocalypse of Paul relates the ravishing of Paul into the third heaven and gives the mysterious words he heard therein. In the fifth century this subject had provided the matter for the *Ascent of Moses*, of which the Apocalypse is a version. This work, filled with Biblical references (*Nescio quibus fabulis plenam*) as Saint Augustine remarks, would seem to have been composed in the 4th century.

I. The *Apocalypse of Thomas* is a Manichaean writing of the fifth century.

I. The *Apocalypse of Stephen* is possibly the fifth century document containing an account of the finding of the Martyr's remains.

■ Several other Apocalypses are either too little known or too recent to be mentioned here. For the Sibylline Oracles see note 3.

1 Editions: C. TISCHENDORF, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Leipzig 1866.

L. MÆS, *Apocrypha anecdota*, Cambridge, 1893 (*Texts and Studies*).

2 *Pat. lat. in Joann.*, 98, 8.

3 Although they differ in many ways, the 14 books of poems (9 and 10 are lost) known by the name of the Sibylline Oracles may be assimilated to the apocryphal. The title of "Sibylline" is hardly justified except by book VII, which contains a collection of ancient oracles of doubtful authenticity. These were collected in the second century by a heretic. Some of them concern Jesus Christ. They contain Jewish characteristics (Bk. III, lines 97-828, dating from the first cent. B. C.; Bk. IV and V, lines 52-530, dating from the end of the 2nd cent. A. D.); but the greater part of the work is a compilation of Christian writings, of Jewish and sometimes heretical origin, written between the second and the third century. Editions: ALEXANDRE, *Oracula Sibyllina*, Paris, 3 vol., 1841-42; GEFFKEN, in *Corpus of Berlin*, Leipzig, 1902. Study: GEFFKEN, *Op. st. a. Chnters.*, viii, 1, Leipzig, 1902.

THIRD PART.

THE FATHERS OF THE IIIrd CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

The Historical, Social and Intellectual Environment.

I. THE HISTORICAL ENVIRONMENT—GENERAL VIEW. |

In order that the great advance made by Patristic Literature in the third century, and the features which distinguish it from the preceding century, should be well understood; we must call to mind the conditions in which the Christians of that time were living. Taken as a whole they were very different from those of the second century. Then, the Church was constantly threatened by cruel but local persecution; in the third century the Christians were subjected to graver official attacks, followed, however, by relatively peaceful intervals somewhat similar to those which took place under Commodus (180-192) and at the beginning of the reign of Septimius Severus (193-211).

The Edict issued by the latter Emperor in 202 marked a new era in the relations of the Roman State with the Church. It abrogated the *conquirendi non sunt* of Trajan; the magistrates were obliged to take up a more active stand against the Christians; in the future the latter were to be sought out, and their prosecution received a kind of official sanction. Persecution by Edicts was about to begin. In the fact that special Edicts were required to set this now universal persecution in movement, caused it to be of a very inconstant nature, since some of the Emperors were very indifferent and others too generous minded. "War was declared but was sometimes interrupted by truces. The State by proscribing the Church officially recognised her existence and reserved the right of treating with her. Two powers (for this name may now be given them) lived

held by side in this manner throughout the third century”¹.
 Thus the Church suffered many assaults of varying intensity, under Septimius Severus after 202, under Maximinian the Thracian (235-238), and from Decius to Valerian (249-260), while awaiting the great crisis which ushered in the fourth century and brought victory with it. P. Allard has calculated that during this period there were 75 years of toleration and peace². It was a relative peace, of course, but it gave the Church a chance of organising and spreading herself. It is true that the Christian spirit sometimes lost some of its intensity, as is proved by the number of *lapsi* in the Decian and Diocletian persecutions. The conditions we have described also explain why the third century was not only a century of defence but also a period during which the activities of the Church took on a greater amplitude.

The official attack of the Imperial forces against the rising power of Christianity was backed up by various efforts to renew declining Paganism. Our attention therefore must be chiefly directed to these religious and philosophical movements, and in particular to Neo-Platonism, which had such a great influence. On the other hand the Church was weakened by a number of *internal troubles* in which were concerned the eminent outstanding doctors of the time. These troubles must be dealt with if we would properly understand the characters and the part played by these men.

II. EFFORTS TO RENEW PAGANISM.

The *Oriental religions* with a Monotheistic tendency and *Hetero-Platonism* must be mentioned here, with a short note regarding the rise of *Manichaeism*, which was to be the cause of so much damage in the Empire at the end of this period.

A). The Oriental religions spread themselves chiefly in the form of *religious syncretism* or *Mithraism*.

Religious Syncretism was brought into favour under the influence of a number of highly educated and energetic Emperors of Roman extraction. Julia Domna, wife of Septimius Severus, and Julia

¹ P. Allard, *Le Christianisme et l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1897, p. 68.

² P. Allard, *Dix leçons sur le Martyre*, Paris, 1906, p. 86.

³ Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le Paganisme romain*, Paris, 1909.

⁴ J. Lagrange, *Les religions orientales et les origines du christianisme*, in the *Revue de théologie*, July 1910, p. 209-241.

⁵ See Christ, *Manuel d'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1916 (new ed.), p. 28 and sq.

Mammaea, mother of Alexander Severus, were very active in this connection. The former, in an endeavour to aid her husband's efforts to stem the rising tide of Christianity, attempted to bring together the old religions around the altar of a new god. The *Sun* was chosen to fill this part, while *Apollonius of Tyana*, a first-century Pythagorean philosopher from Asia Minor, was announced as his prophet, a somewhat mysterious personage had been reputed for his asceticism and miracle working. One of the Court literary hacks, *Philostrates*, wrote given a number of doubtful documents by the Empress and told to write up the virtues of the prophet. The ensuing book became more popular than the religion. The legend of Apollonius gave the Pagans an opportunity of holding up to the Gospel the record of a fine life, a model of all the virtues, strewn with miracles and kind actions. Porphyry, Hierocles and Julian did not miss the opportunity. The Syrian gods, especially the Baals, who were all baptised Jupiter by the Romans, hall their hour of glory; in particular the god of Heliopolis (Baalbek) and the god of Emesa, when Elagabal was its priest. The eclecticism of Julia Mammaea was more tolerant and more favourable to the Christians than that of Domna.

2. Mithraism would appear to have supplanted the other religions about the middle of the third century. Mithra (God of Light), together with Ormuzd (God of Heaven), was the greatest Persian divinity. This religion was practised at a fairly early date in Asia Minor (as witnessed by the name of Mithradates, gift of Mithra). From thence, after the Roman conquest, it was carried to all parts of the Empire by the soldiers. To those souls who were tired of the ancient mythology and aspired to a more elevated ideal it proffered a number of mysterious initiations which purported to lead the elect to perfection through seven successive stages. These stages were indicated by the symbolical names which were given to the initiates; 1) *corax* (crow), 2) *cryptus* (veiled), 3) *miles* (soldier), 4) *leo* (lion), 5) *Perses* (Persian), 6) *Heliodromus* (solar messenger), 7) *pater* (father).

The chief practice was the frightful ceremony of the *taurobolus*. The supposed ritual similarities between Mithraism and Christianity have been greatly exaggerated by Salomon Reinach,* for they are entirely distinct, both by their moral and doctrinal teaching. The fixing of the birth of Jesus on the 25th December, the day on which the devotees of Mithra celebrated the *Natalis Solis Invicti* was the result of a calculation quite independent of exterior influence. Aurelian (271-275) was a great worshipper of the Sun and caused a temple to be raised to him in Rome. This religion became very popular among the Pagans and created a serious hindrance to the progress of Christianity.

B). Neo-Platonism was at the same time a philosophy and a religion, or, to put it briefly, a religious philosophy.

* *Christus*, p. 519-528. See A. N. A. L. K. S., [Za religion de Mithra in *Diet*, col. 578-591.]

2 See I. R. Lagrange, *Quelques remarques sur Orphée de M. Salomon Reinach*, Paris, 1910.

3 See A. D'Alès, *loc. cit.*

4 R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin*, Paris, 1927. 1

It proposed to take the place of Paganism drowning in the sea of indifference. Had not Philo already adapted Hellenism to Judaism? And the seed of Alexandrian Neoplatonism may be found in Plutarch. It did not attain its full flower, however, until the third century, in the philosophical school founded by *Ammonius Saccas* (d. 243), which was attended by Origen. The real creator of the system was *Plotinus* (d. 270), who directed the school after the death of Saccas. It was Porphyry, one of his pupils, who gathered together the 54 treatises which explain his doctrine of the "Enneads" (6 books, each containing 9 treatises). Neoplatonism kept on the polytheist pantheon for the sake of the vulgar crowd, but it built one or two stories above it for the initiated. This transformation of Hellenism into theology became immensely popular.

The system was based on a new theodicy. Three moments or conditions must be distinguished in God: a kind of Trinity, comprising *Being in itself*, abstract and undetermined, the common source and origin of all being; it is unknowable and ineffable: the *Intellect* (Νοῦς) or the Intelligible, which is an image of the subsisting Being from which It emanates; it alone is knowable and the prototype of all beings: then the *Soul* (Ψυχή) which derives from the Intellect as if it were its thought; like the Stoic Logos, It is the World-Soul. This God in three conditions, all living one from the other and going from the abstract to the concrete, combined Plato's idealism with Zeno's pantheism.

Individual souls are but emanations from the universal Soul. The *human soul* (or at least the spiritual soul, since man also possesses a material soul which dies with the body) cannot free itself from the matter in which it is encased in order to attain perfection by returning, first, to the *universal Soul*, then to the Intellect and finally to the subsisting Being: such is the immediate foundation of Neo-Platonist morality. It consists in an effort to free oneself from matter

and thus achieve unity with God. The return to God comprises three stages: *a*) the practice of *asceticism* delivers the Soul from the weight of the senses and restores it to its original primitive state; *b*) the *illumination* which is obtained by the effort of philosophical reflection and the consideration

of abstract realities elevates the soul to the stage of Intellect to which it unites it; c) lastly, the *ecstasy* or extatic contemplation, vouchsafed only to the few, unites the soul to the subsisting Being.

Thus, educated and cultured men, disgusted with the Pagan fables, found in Neo-Platonism an attractive doctrine and a noble and elevated ideal. Nevertheless, in spite of certain appearances to the contrary, it is easy to perceive the radical differences which separate this philosophy from Christian teaching. These may be noticed not only in the theology of the Trinity, but also in the moral and mystical doctrine which leads the soul to union with God. In Neo-Platonism this union is the result of intellectual *abstraction* and not of *grace*, which has no place in the system. Neither was any importance given to *prayer*, although it was retained, or introduced, probably to satisfy the instinct of the common people. Even *virtue*, in this system, has not a really moral character: it is no more than an effort of the soul to free itself from a foreign element, matter, instead of being the result of an effort by which the will overcomes itself, as it were, and turns itself entirely to good, rendering itself better, by means of union with a better and perfect being. The *spirit of this intellectual and proud doctrine* is obviously diametrically opposed to that of Christianity. It was profoundly modified by those Christian doctors who were affected by it, and the changes which they made are more radical than apparent.

C). Manichaeism was originally a Pagan sect; later, however, it borrowed a great deal from Christianity and thus became a kind of heresy. The founder was of noble descent and was born near Ekbatana (Persia) about 215. Mani proclaimed himself the prophet of divine revelation in order to give a new lease of life to the ancient Persian or Chaldaean religion. From the year 240 he preached his doctrine in many regions of Asia Minor beyond the boundaries of Persia. Having returned to his country in 276 he was put to death. His body was flayed and his skin, stuffed with straw, was hung up at the gates of the capital.

1 R. Arnou, *op. cit.*, 222-227.

* *ibid.*, p. 49-50.

* See P. Charles, *Le Plotinisme*, art. in *Revue Neo-Scholastique*, 19aJ (concerning R. Arnou's thesis), p. 75-76.

* J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* I, p. 467-474. G. Bardy, *Manichisme*, *til Diet, thio!*, col. 1841-1895.

The essence of his teaching * is *dualism*, *a*). There are *two* *kingdoms*, that of *Light* (physical and moral good) which is governed by God, and that of *Darkness* (physical and moral). Satan issues forth from the darkness, invades the realms of light and declares « *h* on God. *b*). *Man*, whom God created with pure elements, is made a prisoner by Satan who plants in him the seeds of darkness. From that time man is become the subject of struggle between God and his angels, *c*). *The freeing* of man can only be accomplished by the practice of severe asceticism, which comprises three seals or mortifications (*signaculum oris, manus, sinus*).

The society comprises two classes of adepts, the *Elect* or monks, and the *Auditors* (simple faithful). In the time of Saint Augustine, the hierarchy, modelled on that of the Church, consisted of: *a*) the *Presbyters* (12); *b*) the *Administrators* (72); *c*) the *Presbyters*; *d*) lastly, the *Deacons* and *Missionaries*. Their worship, which in the beginning was very summary, soon borrowed much from Christianity.

Manichaeism spread rapidly and exercised considerable influence in the East and the West. It lasted until the Middle Ages.

III. CHRISTIAN DOCTRINAL ENVIRONMENT.

THE TRINITARIAN QUESTION.

Diverse doctrinal tendencies developed in the Church itself; they must be studied if we are to understand the fathers of this period. Some of these doctrinal movements, in spite of their audacity, were wholly orthodox; others, however, became openly heretical.

First of all, it is important to note a certain opposition which arose in many countries (Rome, Carthage, and especially Alexandria) between those who are termed the partisans of the popular faith and the partisans of scholarly theology. The former were content with the traditional formulas, which expressed the Christian mysteries and were in no wise concerned in making them richer by means of philosophical speculation. They were termed *simplices* (or *simpliciores*), *imprudentes*, *idiotes* (*Tertullian*). Even Saint Irenaeus, who, like them, was instinctively suspicious of philosophy, gave them the name of ἰδιῶται, ὀλιγομαθεῖ. Other Christians, on the contrary, coming from Paganism

I * Mani wrote a great deal. We are acquainted with at least seven works and many letters. The *Epistola fundamenti*, refuted by Saint Augustine, would appear to be one of the reformer's treatises. A number of important Manichaean writings have recently been discovered in Mongolia.

I · J. Lebreton, *Le disaccord de la foi populaire et de la théologie savante dans l'histoire chrétienne du III^e siècle* (in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1923, p. 481-506; 1924, p. 5-37).

possessed of a sound classical culture, desired to use their studies and knowledge, not only in order to defend their faith before the public authority, but also in order to obtain a better understanding of their faith, to penetrate it, explain it and discover its solid foundation. Their intentions were praiseworthy and in the long run bore good fruit; but in the beginning they aroused the suspicion of many less well educated believers who feared to see their faith compromised by the invasion of philosophy.

The mystery of the Trinity usually formed the object on these researches. The Trinitarian question came to the fore from the very first years of Christianity. How was the *divine unity*, which the first Christians, like the Jews before them, were obliged to affirm in face of the surrounding polytheism, to be reconciled with the assertion that *Jesus is God*, as is also the *Holy Ghost*? These affirmations were the very essence of Christianity and the outstanding feature of the Creed. In the third century, Gnostic dualism made it even more necessary to insist on the unity of God. How then was the divinity of Christ to be explained? The *Apologists* made an attempt by outlining a theology of the Word. It was far from attaining perfection, but neither was it so Arian as has sometimes been supposed. Their mode of expression is due to their special point of view.¹ *Saint Irenaeus* also had recourse to philosophical speculation, but he preferred, as a rule, to study those points on which philosophy has less to say, such as the Redemption and salvation.² *Tertullian*, who began by protesting against ambitious philosophy, went far beyond the expressions of the *Creed* and called in the help of philosophy when refuting Praxeas. *Hippolytus* and *Novatian*, at Rome, made even greater advances.³ But it was chiefly at Alexandria that the movement developed.

The Alexandrians laid particular emphasis on the *philosophical tendencies* which had first been manifested by the Apologists. Like the latter, they preferred to consider the Divine Persons in their relations with creatures. As a rule they did not rise to a consideration of God in Himself, except by a study of his activity *ab extra*. They did not

* See above, p. 109.

*J. Lebreton, *op. cit.*, p. 483-487.

• *Ibid.*, p. 487-490.

lect this activity as manifested in the physical creation, but their attention was chiefly directed to the world of souls and spirits, for the Alexandrians were *mystics* in a greater measure than they were philosophers. They were greatly pre-occupied by the return of the soul to God, through Christ Who is the Way, and the Holy Ghost, Who is His messenger. This point of view implies a certain *subordinationism*, but it is entirely exterior to the interior life of God. No doubt the latter is revealed to us to a certain extent by analogy, but the attributes which show the relations of the Divine Persons with creatures cannot be exactly applied to the relations of the Divine Persons among themselves. As will be seen, there is no trace of subordinationism in *Clement of Alexandria*. There is less of it in *Origen* than at first appears. His famous disciples, such as Gregory of Nyssa (Nicolaus), Saint Dionysius of Alexandria and, at a later date, Saint Athanasius, Didymus and Saint Basil were careful to avoid this danger. Origen is in no way responsible for those *imprudent* and unreflecting disciples who paved the way for the radical subordinationism of Arius, while the true forerunners of Arius belong to another school.

Two other matters which preoccupied the third century Fathers and gave rise to disciplinary controversies may be mentioned here: Penance and the baptism of heretics, which they will be dealt with in the chapters which concern the persons who were most closely connected with them; Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Novation for the former, and Saint Cyprian for the latter.

IV. ERRORS REGARDING THE TRINITY.

1. Modalism. Among the heresies which denied the Trinity in the third century, *Modalism* takes the first place. According to this error, there is but one and the same Person in God, but it is called the Father, Son or Holy Ghost according to the successive manifestation of its various attributes. Essentially the Persons are no more than the different points of view (*modes*) we adopt for the consideration of God, based on the manifestation of His works. This error was exposed in this learned manner, however, but *Unitarianism* was given a number of other names

¹ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, i, p. 353-356.

which corresponded to the viewpoints of its first propagators, It was called respectively a) *Monarchianism* because the reformers everywhere proclaimed: monarchy, monarchy! "*monarchiam, inquit, tenemus*", writes Tertullian; b-) *Patripassianism*, in which the Father is considered to be identical with the Son and to have suffered with Him. In the East the Modalists were also called *υιοπάτορες* because they confused the Son with the Father.

The beginnings of this error are lost in obscurity. The first to have spread it are Praxeas and Noetus. It would seem that *Praxeas* was an Asiatic who remained in Rome after having come there for the purpose of denouncing Montanism. He took advantage of the benevolence of Popei Zephyrinus in order to spread his teaching, but when he was imprudent enough to go to Carthage he was shown up by Tertullian¹ who composed his *Adversus Praxeam*. Hippolytus, who does not seem to have known of Praxeas, came to grips especially with *Noetus* who was spreading a similar teaching in Smyrna, and refuted him in the *Contra Noetum*. Other protagonists of the Modalist teaching were *Epigonus*, who founded a sect in Rome at the commencement of the third century; *Cleomenes* who succeeded him, and lastly *Sabellius* who, at the same time under Zephyrinus or Callistus, acquired considerable influence and gave his name to a faction. *Sabellianism* gradually underwent a number of important modifications. When the Fathers of the fourth century began to refute it, its doctrine had taken on an extremely subtle form indeed. It had been so constituted from the end of the third century in the time of Dionysius of Alexandria.

In the older system there was only a question of the Son and the Father. The Holy Ghost was introduced into a perfected Unitarianism called Modalism, which moreover rejected Patripassianism properly so called. God is *unity*, simple and indivisible; He is the Father-Son (*υιοπάτωρ*). He is called the *Word* inasmuch as He is Creator; *Father*, as the lawgiver of the Old Testament; *Son* in so much as He is the Redeemer; and *Holy Ghost* inasmuch as He is the Sanctifier. It is nevertheless one and the same person who underlies all these different aspects. These various states are *transitory*, in the sense that God ceases to be the Father

¹ *Adv. Prax.*, 3.

in order to become the Son by the Incarnation, and the Son alone suffered. But on the other hand, the modes are equal and all persons can in no way be subordinated. It is thus that Modalism differs from Arianism or radical subordinationism.*

1. Adoptianism 2 is an error which, although it has usually been likened to Monarchianism, is preferably to be distinguished from it. It certainly denied the unity of the Divine Persons. But it did not start from there; it began by denying Christ's divinity, and on this count also, it differs from Modalism. Christ is not God; He is only *adopted* by God. Thus the name of *Adoptianism*, which was proposed by Iarnack, is perfectly fitting. This Unitarian Adoptianism must not be confused with the Spanish Adoptianism (VIII century) which did not deny the Trinity.

Its originators of the system were two sectaries, both bearing the name of *Theodotus*. The first, who is also called *Theodotus the Elder*, was a rich leather-seller of Byzantium. An erudite and well-educated Christian, he apostasized during a persecution and came to Rome to build himself. In order to justify himself, he averred that he had not killed God, for Jesus Christ is but a man whom God *adopted* at his Baptism and to whom He gave divine power to fulfil his mission. He was excommunicated in 190 by Saint Victor and became leader of a sect. He based his doctrine on the writings of the philosophers and an entirely literal and grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures.

Another *Theodotus*, called the *Banker*, completed his theories at the beginning of the third century by a number of strange speculations on Millisdech.

About the middle of third century the Adoptianist teaching was represented by a certain *Artemon* or *Artemas* who taught at Rome. Very little is known of this person; according to the Council which condemned him at Paul of Samosata, he was the "Father in heresy" of this latter.

Paul of Samosata⁴, an ambitious and intriguing upstart, under the patronage of Queen Zenobia, was both bishop and gatherer at Antioch about the year 260. He also had it in mind to become a doctor. The better to combat the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos, he denied the divinity of Christ and declared that Jesus was but an ordinary man to whom God had revealed Himself more than to any other prophet; to call Him God was but a rhetorical figure of speech.

* Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, i, p. 482-484.

p. 349-352.

* Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 352.

* *Ibid.*, 462-467. See G. Barov, *Paul de Samosate*, Louvain-Paris, 1923.

He was attacked in a Council which assembled at Antioch in 264, presided by Firmilian of Caesarea. He escaped by using the then ambiguous term of *δμοούσιον*, taking *οὐαί* to mean both nature and person. He was haled before another Council in 268 to explain himself clearly. He failed, was shown to be in error, deposed, and the term *δ^οοῦσιοι* was forbidden. Paul, supported by Zenobia, managed to stay on in Antioch and refused to give up a property belonging to the Church. In 272, however, the Emperor Aurelian, the future persecutor, decided that the property in question rightly belonged to those who were in communion with the Italian bishops and the bishop of Rome.

The doctrine of Paul of Samosata is a modalist form of Adoptianism. Paul retained the name of the *Three Person* in the administration of baptism and in theological teaching, but in reality he did away with the personality of the Son and the Holy Ghost. It was in this sense that he applied to the Logos the term *δμοούσιον* (consubstantial), a formula compromised by his *modalist* interpretation. Moreover, he taught that Christ was not God, but a man united to wisdom (*συναφθεῖ τῇ σοφίᾳ*), by means of a purely accidental union produced by the virtue of God residing within him (*ἐνοίκησι κατ' ἐνέργειαν*). Thus, the Adoptianist teaching prepared the way for Nestorianism.

Many attempts have been made to rehabilitate Paul of Samosata. The most recent attempt is that of F. Loofs.¹ According to him, Paul was a great representative of the oldest Christian tradition which based its philosophy on Stoicism, had a Unitarian leaning in Theology, and favoured dualism in its Christology. He was a victim of the followers of the new school of thought deriving from Origen; this was Neo-Platonic with strong Trinitarian leanings, inclining to unity and monophysism in Christology. It must be said that F. Loofs' attempt at doctrinal reconstitution is more like a fairy story than history. That of G. Bardy is vastly different and based on solid grounds.

¹ F. Loofs, *Paulus von Samosata*, Leipzig, 1924. Regarding this work, see G. Barov, *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1924, p. 512 sq., and J. Lehreton, *Rech. St. Rei.*, 1925, p. 365 sq.

CHAPTER II.

Clement of Alexandria.

i Special bibliography.

I i. Editions: *P. G.*, 8 and 9 (Edit. Potter, 1715). O. STAEHLIN, in *lir Corpus Beri.*, Leipzig, 1905-1909.

Studies: A. de LA Barre, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, in the *Diet.* col. 137-199. Mgr. Freppel, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1866. F de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*. A study on the relations of Iuistianity and Greek philosophy in the 2nd century, Paris, 1898. (certain criticisms of this work in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1900, p. 301-307, le A. Labeau). W. Capitaine, *Die Moral des Clemens von Alexan-* // n, Paderborn, 1903. J. Patrick, *Clement of Alexandria*, Edinburgh, U91.I. J. Tixeront, *Le Pédagogue*, in *Mélanges*, p. 90-116; *Hist. / ni.*, i, p. 281-296. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante...*, p. 295-315; *j•ludes* (Eucharistie), p. 248-261. J. Lebreton, *Le désaccord de la foi Populaire et de la théologie savante dans j'Eglise chrétienne au VU siisele*, in the *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1923 (xix), p. 481-506 (chiefly Ai 491-501) and 1924 (xx), p. 5-37. For spirituality and moral teaching *■ I. GuilloUX, in *Rev. Ascétique et Mystique*, 1922 (p. 282-300), ■>"«. A. Ménager in the *Vie Spirituelle*, 1923 (p. 407-430), and Ili. Hardy, *Clément d'Al.* (coll. *Mor. Chrét.*), Paris, 1926.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

THE SCHOOL OF ALEXANDRIA.

I According to Saint Epiphanius, Titus Flavius Clemens i «.i. probably a native of Athens². He was born of Pagan p.h cuts about the year 150. Nothing is known of the i in umstances of his conversion, but from what we know of In character it would not be exaggerated to suppose that, llike Saint Justin, he was attracted to Christianity by the Itioliility and the purity of its moral teaching. Being desirous lol intensifying his knowledge of Christianity he undertook In ries of journeys in search of masters of Christian thought, lit was thus that after having visited Italy, Syria and II'.destine, he came at last to Egypt about 180, where his ■mil "found rest" at Alexandria with the eminent teacher, >> .lint Pantaenus.

¹ in particular Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, v, cb. ti; vi. ch. 6, ti, 12, 13.

² ITH., *Hares.*, 32, 6.

Pantaenus "the bee of Sicily", before finally coming!" rest at Alexandria, had been a missionary in the East, in Arabia. He was the first known teacher of the famous Didascalia, "the school of oral teaching" which he directed for a long time. His method of teaching was chiefly oral. In spite of the affirmation made by Eusebius and many ancient authors, the critics do not think that he left any writings. He died a little before the year 200.

Clement knew how to appreciate Pantaenus and never left him. After having enumerated the teachers he had known, he adds: "But he whom I met last of all, and wlm was the first in worthiness, I found hidden in Egypt, and I have never since sought for any other". From being al first an ordinary' disciple, Clement soon became the collaborator of Pantaenus. It was perhaps then that he became a priest. On the death of the master, he became leader of the catechetical school and had the glory of having Origed as a disciple. His teaching came to an end in 202-203 afl the beginning of the persecution of Septimius Severus, which necessitated the closing of the school.

Clement withdrew from Alexandria and went to his formel pupil, Bishop Alexander of Cappadocia. He died between tini years 211 (at this date he brought a letter to Antioch from Alexander in which his good services in Cappadocia are men tioned) and 216 (another letter from the same Alexander, now Bishop of Jerusalem, speaks of Clement as already dead) 4 Early writers give him the name of saint. Benedict XIV had his name taken from the Roman Martyrologium, not on account of the many inexactitudes and exaggerations present in his writings, but because it was found that prior to the eleventh century no cultus was accorded to him in any Church with the express or tacit consent of authority.

The dominant feature in the character of Clement of Alexandria is his moral preoccupation and his desire <| uplifting the souls of his contemporaries. It has been sail that he was above all "an educator, a marvellous awaken- of souls ", Although the moral formation which he gavi was based on a solid and ardent Christian piety, like Saini Justin, Clement did not neglect to search the *philosophers* :!| anything that could help him, or act as a starting point if

1 Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.* v, 10.

2 *Ibid.* vi, 11, 14.

In teaching. His method thus consists in abundant and inconcentrating quotation from early writers. This led him to bring together in one context a number of disparate and incoherent texts, which often obscured his meaning or even gave it a positively contrary sense. His prodigious learning, unsurpassed even by that of Origen, appeared to have no other rule than the enthusiasm of the apostle. His style is smooth and facile, but his loose and irregular composition often hinders us from following the author's meaning through the labyrinth of his quotations and digressions.

His profound knowledge of early literature enabled Clement to be the first to expose with abundance, although with a pedagogical and moral purpose, rather than apologetical and theological, the relations of philosophy and Christianity, of reason and of faith. He was thus a pioneer and, thanks to him, the School of Alexandria was able to carry out its providential mission. In fact, Alexandria, at the end of the second and the beginning of the third century, became a first-class centre of influence in the East, eclipsing the churches of Asia and of Syria. As Father Prat remarks, "From that period Rome was the heart of the Catholic world, Alexandria was already the brain".

The Didascalia (το τῇ κατηγήσεω διδασκαλεῖο?) would appear to have been in existence, like the school of the catechumens, from the very beginnings of the Alexandrian church. In the middle of the second century it became very important, and developed into a school of scientific theology, depending on the bishop, who named and dismissed its heads as he pleased. Unlike the schools of Justin and Origen which were private establishments, it possessed an official character. But even in the time of Origen its organization was of a most rudimentary nature. The first teacher whose name has been preserved was Pantaenus. The teachers came from extremely diverse categories; they were catechists, catechumens, or baptised Christians, nearly all having a smattering of philosophy, chiefly eclectic, representatives of all the anomalous philosophies which found common ground in Alexandria. Gnosticism in particular the most dangerous and the most deep-rooted.

1 I UAT, *Origine*, Paris, 1907, p. XI.

2 A. de la Barre, (*Ecole chrétienne d'Alexandrie*, in *Did. th.*, p. 824).

It was therefore the special mission of the School at Alexandria to *react* against these Gnostic tendencies, and it is at this *polemical standpoint* that in many cases we must place ourselves if we would understand the importance of its teaching. The masters of the Didascalia, in particular Clement and Origen, were carried forward in the stream of the doctrinal apostolate best suited to Alexandria, and were also influenced by and reacted to the philosophical atmosphere in which they lived. They thus came to create a *powerful intellectual movement* which was characterised by the definite principles to which they made appeal, and by the specific method they used for the development of theology. It is this intellectual movement which really deserves the name of *School of Alexandria*, one day to find a rival in the School at Antioch. Origen was the real founder of this school, but Clement had already paved the way for him, even more by his moral and mystical teaching than by his philosophy.

II. WRITINGS OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

Many of the writings of Clement of Alexandria are no longer extant. Apart from his exegetical fragments and one homily, there remain three great works which have so greatly contributed to his reputation.

A). I. The "Outlines" (ὀπουπώσεσι) are a series of notes in 8 books on selected passages of the Old or the New Testament. On fragments of these are now extant. The exegesis was chiefly of an allegorical nature. Photius, who was acquainted with this work, criticises it with perhaps excessive severity and points out many errors to be found in it.

2. The *Quis dives salvetur*³ is a delightful homily, greatly appreciated by the ancient world. It deals with the words of Jesus (J/A 17-31) concerning the young man who refused to follow Him. Clement shows that wealth is not of itself evil; its morality depends on the good or ill use made of it. The work concludes with the famous narrative of the criminal converted by Saint John.

B) The Hortatory Discourse to the Greeks⁴ (προτροπικὸν) is a short apology in 12 chapters, beautifully written both as regards the matter and the style. In the introduction Clement uses the pretty legend of the grasshopper and Eunomius the Locrian, the harp-player, to exhort the reader

¹ See below p. 296.

² P. G., 9, 743-750.

³ P. G., 9, 603-652.

⁴ P. G., 8, 49246.

listen to a new canticle, that of the Word, whose melody
 «ridues the fiercest and hardest natures.

In *first part* is a criticism of Paganism, its gods and its worship (III. 1-4), and of the philosophers and poets who have false notions of divinity (ch. 5-7). The whole of the *second part* is full of fiery exhortations to become converted to Christianity. Clement finely answers the objections of those who still hesitate; we cannot cast off our old customs! We can no longer suck your nurses' milk... the child, become man, quits his playthings; Paganism is no more than the toy of humanity's childhood... These pages reveal a wholly Christian soul, animated with an anxiety towards Christ. They are a patent refutation of those who maintain that Clement was more of a philosopher than a Christian.

In (J. The Tutor) is composed of three books. The first book in 13 chapters, shows Christ as an educator of souls, while the two others point out the vices which Christians in particular must avoid.

Even the *first book* is essentially practical, dealing with the educative action of the Word. *Three parts* may be distinguished: *a*) in chapters 2-4 we are shown that the true tutor is Christ, the Word made man, a mild and extremely good Being; He is the father and we are the children; *b*~) in chapters 5-10, Clement refutes the Gnostics who use the word *ἐπίοδος* (Mildness) given to the baptised, to prove that there are two different kinds of Christians, the imperfect and the perfect. Baptism, says Clement, contains the seed of perfection (the gnosis) and all are called to acquire it; *e*) chapters 11-13 complete the description of the Tutor; goodness is his predominant trait, but it does not exclude firmness. As Clement observes against Marcion, this goodness has been from the beginning of the world.

Books II and III reveal Clement as a fine moralist and a close observer of the customs of his time. He enumerates the principal vices of the Alexandrian society, scourges them energetically and exhorts the new Christians to abstain from them. Turn and turn about, he discusses drinking, taking recreation, conversation, perfumes, crowns, vanity in dress, luxury, etc., and gives wise and witty advice on them all.

Id. The Trilogy of Clement. The three first and most important writings compose what may well be called *his great trilogy of Clement*. He exposed its plan and proposed at the beginning of the "Tutor". The Word, the motions of encompassing our salvation by degrees, adopts an

1. 1: 8, 247-684.

• A. D. Barre, *op. cit.*, coll. 144 sq.

excellent method ; first of all, He exhorts to conversion (προτρέπων) then He disciplines (ἐπειτα παιδαγωγών) and finally instructs (ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἐκδιδάσκων)τ. The purpose of the *second work* therefore, is to draw the reader away from Paganism and lead him to the Christian faith. The *second* teaches newly baptised to free himself from vice, and passion unworthy of the Christian; it is in reality a practical moral treatise. The *third*, which according to the above mentions plan ought to have been entitled the Master (ὁ Διδάσκαλος) would appear to have been a dogmatic and speculative treatise for the purpose of completing the Christian's instruction. The *Miscellanies* (Stromata) do not altogether fit it with this plan, and in consequence the critics are divided. 1

M. de Faye², insisting on Clement's interest in education, believes that the *third work* was never written and that the *Miscellanies* are but a complement to the Tutor, containing a moral teaching which was meant to render the Christian more apt to receive a projected doctrinal teaching and which, for various reasons, was postponed. On the other hand, the majority of authors is inclined to consider the *Miscellanies* as the third writing and agree that they embody in a fair measure the original plan, in spite of their pronounced moral character. Moreover, Clement's intention was less to provide the reader with a theological compendium than to build up within him a *perfect Christian* by means of a more profound theoretical and practical knowledge of human and divine things. This knowledge derives from the contemplation of divine wisdom, the principle of living knowledge, the fruit of the Word and the Holy Ghost and the crown of Christian life; such is the gnosis.

E). *Miscellanies* * {*Stromata*}. At the beginning of his "*Atticæ*", Aulus-Gellius gives a whole series of bizarre titles which would appear to have been reserved to writings of a particular nature: compilations, selected readings, dissertations stuffed with texts, manuals, collections of all kinds. The *stromata* or *miscellanies* are found in this list, with the gardens, flower-beds, etc. Clement chose this title on account of the freedom which it leaves to the author, and he used this liberty without stint. He also wished to hide his ideas from his opponents and in many cases he has succeeded only too well.

I. The *two first miscellanies* give a brief exposition of all Clement's ideas.

1 Tutor, i, i.

• E. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p. 78-86.

3 P. G., 8, 685-1382 (bks. 1-4) and 9, 9-602 (bks. 5-8).

li. *first* (29 ch.) is a kind of *introduction* and establishes that the In i. lian has not only the right to write but also that of studying and »ii, philosophy. Clement exposes the method he is going to employ. h. . iher with the sacred authors, he constantly quotes the Greek philo- lipliers, who, as he says, have plagiarised the Scriptures.

I he *second Miscellany* (23 chapters) gives the outline of the utlior's doctrine. Therein, in particular, may be found:) a *theory of the faith*, described as the only means of (lining to a true knowledge of God (ch. 2) and even as the u i necessary basis of all knowledge (ch. 4); b) a theory of the 'i i tues; they have their principle in fear (ch. 8) out of which nines penance (once given after baptism) (ch. 13); they are ll connected (ch. 9) and find their perfection in charity and lie gnosis; c) lastly, a *description of the "true Gnostic"*, the h i llect Christian (ch. 19-22) who carries in himself the image il God according to the teaching of the Scriptures and of 'l ito. This resemblance to God supposes the suppression il i amai desires and thus the author is led to speak of ltu riage in the following Miscellany.

The three following miscellanies (m-v) again deal with various Jltlers that have already been mentioned or treated in the second.

Ilic *Hird* (18 chapters) is almost wholly concerned with *marriage*. Tl< author demonstrates that it is lawful, and refutes the false Gnostics, flu-, apologetical purpose explains why he dwelt so long on this subject ul why he praised the conjugal state in terms which, at first sight, seem ll< mnpatible with his doctrine of perfection.

I lie *IVthtyfi* chapters) leads Clement, while on the subject of *mar- yrdmn* (which he praises, 4-8), to blame those who offer themselves oliintarily to the executioner (to), to recommend patience (16), lri. i hment from the world and other virtues. He gives another Unirait of the true Gnostic (21-22) which completes that of the second liiii ellany, but which is not so exaggerated as those of the last l'u. Perfect knowledge, or the gnosis, is not opposed to the faith; ii i li- t deliverance from the passions (ἀπάθεια) is the goal to be attained; In perfect man, although he uses created things, at the same time llini i nates them and thus achieves unity.

the *Vth* (14 chapters) is specially concerned with the *perfect know- fié, of Godaxdi* points out the chief means of obtaining it; in particular, jfiM (exhaustively treated in ch. 1), the use of symbolism (συμβολικόν l-), employed both by the Pagans and the Jews (4-10), and above all, li i uive theology in preference to affirmative theology, in order that lliilu opomorphism may be more surely avoided (11-12).

The last two Miscellanies (vi-vu), according to certain critics, lie posterior to Clement's departure from Alexandria, and contain, in lu i i entuated form, all the personal ideas of the author'. *purpose*

here is more immediately apologetical; he would prove that the *immi* Gnostic alone is the truly religious man.

The *Vlth* (18 chapters), like the *vt*h, treats of Christian *re/ig/ou* knowledge, but compares it to that of the Pagans, which is inferior: (lid philosophers have borrowed much from the Bible (ch. 2-4); moreover they are not capable of imparting true wisdom, which produces sticfl a marvellous series of effects and which forms a hierarchy of the *pei fnci* in heaven (7-14); nevertheless, both human knowledge and philosophy] are not without their uses, provided they are subordinated to faith amll thé gnosis: indeed, philosophy is a gift of God, and has been providon tial in preparing the Gentiles for Christianity (15-18).

The *Vllth Miscellany* is both the most interesting and tin- most easy to read, since the author develops his ideas logli cally instead of by means of quotations from the Scripture» and the philosophers. He gives a fuller description of tlvi true gnostic, especially of his *religious life*: a) The gnostic ll intimately *united* to God through the Word, to whose inspi. rations he is obedient. By becoming a new man he take on the resemblance to God and to the Word, His Son ami His Wisdom; that is true sacrifice, real worship perfecting the soul at the same time that it serves God (ch. 1-5); *hi* hit *prayer* is *unceasing* because it is based on the univers» presence of God; it is a continual correspondence betwee- God, Who gives Himself, and the soul, which co-operatesl lastly, its object is chiefly supernatural (ch. 6-9); i) the *inorai worth* of the perfect Christian surpasses that of the ordinari Christian; his actions are made better by the charitabl motive which animates them and by the efficacy of the gnosis; his virtues, especially fortitude, courage and tempo! rance, since they are founded on charity, are intensified in aa eminent degree (ch. 10-14) '.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

In any study of the teaching of Clement of Alexandria, two matters especially must be considered :

1. His moral and mystical teaching;
2. His theological doctrine properly so called.

! It is very doubtful whether there ever existed an *VHllh Miscellana* Various isolated texts which, according to certain authors, are extracts from [U are regarded by others as being no more than notes, which he intended to ma either for another miscellany or for a dogmatic work which was never published See A. de la Barre, *op. cit.*, col. 145.

vi. Moral and Mystical Doctrine. The dominant feature of Clement's teaching is its *moral* element, to which everything else is reduced. And this moral teaching is ever received of as an *ascension*, each stage of which ((προκοπή) brings the soul nearer to the state of the perfect man, εἰς ἀνδράμιον,» (Eph. IV, 13)'. The successive states through which the Christian passes are regarded as "dwelling places" (ἐνοικοισμοί) true "mansions of the soul". They are characterized by the different motives which inspire their usual mode of acting: *fear* (which Clement justified, against the musties) 3, *hope*,* and, lastly, *charity* 5, which alone is worthy motive for a really good action.

Clement usually divides Christians into *two classes*: the *simple Christians* who have only the common faith (κοινή πίστις) and the *gnostics* or perfect Christians who possess a more highly developed faith. Between these two classes there is quite an essential distinction, but only a difference of degree, Clement's doctrine is taken from Saint Paul (I Cor., II, 6), and those who oppose critics are in error who reproach Clement with it. It is justly different from the theories of the false Gnostics, and it was chiefly as a counterblast to these theories that it was proposed by the author. It may be, however, that at times he has laid too much stress on the features that characterize the perfect man, thus giving the impression that the others are a despised and inferior class of Christians.

According to Clement, three elements enter into the nature of perfection: 1) *apatheia*, 2) *charity*, 3) the *gnosis*.

i. Apatheia (ἀπάθεια) is a consequence of divine union. The latter produces in the soul a state bordering on Stoic impassibility; the true Gnostic not only brings his body into subjection and masters his passions, but also banishes all traces of sensibility. Apatheia, nevertheless, is not inertia or inaction; it goes hand in hand with the interior labour of the soul. It is to be acquired especially by resistance to temptation, mortification of the senses and resignation to God. Certain affirmations would seem exaggerated, but this is often due to the employment of expressions drawn

1 *mil.* VII, 2, col. 413.

2 *L.*, col. 416.

3 *Il.*, II, 7, 8, col. 968-976.

4 *L.*, II, 6, col. 960 sq.; 12, col. 990 sq.; V, 3, col. 31 sq.

5 *L.*, VI, 9, col. 293, 296, 297 etc.

6 *L.*, IV, 5, col. 1233; vi, 9, col. 293; 13, col. 325, 328.

from Stoic philosophers; their meaning must be brought within the limits of the author's teaching considered as a whole. The holy indifference, of which Saint Francis of Sales, the most moderate of mystics, has so excellently spoken, often differs but little from Clement's apatheia.

2. Charity is the summit of the Gnostic ascension. This virtue which, according to Clement, brings God with it at the same time as it is brought by Him, θεωφοροῦσα κὶ θεωφορουμένη is above all the principle of the soul's union (by the subordination of its faculties) and the principle of a union with God. Thus, when the Gnostic receives one of these characters (ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ χαρακτηρίζεται)¹ he becomes a perfect man: *in virum perfectum, in mensuram ætatis plenitudinis Christi* (Eph. iv, 13).

3. The gnosis, or *perfect knowledge*, according to Clement of Alexandria, is the leading and most characteristic element of perfection. J. Lebreton observes that "this Gnosis is not the knowledge born of human speculation, but a more elevated *religious knowledge*, due to a special revelation; it is an *intuition* which initiates him, to whom it is vouchsafed to mysteries forbidden to the common run; it transforms his religious and moral life, lifts him out of the servile condition common to all men, and makes him a friend of God, equal and even superior to the angels" ³.

In this description all the features of the orthodox Alexandrian gnosis are strongly brought out. It is distinguished: 1. from *simple faith*, which it renders more perfect; 2. from *theological speculation*, which of itself does not impart that mystical light, added to that of faith, which Clement considers essential; 3. from *contemplation properly so called* which is infused and does not necessarily imply any disinterested activity. It is, at the same time, a mixed knowledge of divine and human, intuitive and discursive. It is not something purely imaginary, as some have thought, but must be identified with *perfect meditative contemplation* ⁴. Indeed, as Clement usually describes it, it marvellously resembles the

¹ Perfection comprises "a light united to the soul, due to an unceasing union which bears God with it and comes from Him" (φωρὴ ἡνωμένον ψυχῇ καὶ ἀδιάσπαστον, Θεοφοροῦσα καὶ θεωφορουμένη). *Strom.*, vi, 12, col. 331.

² *Strom.*, vii, 11, col. 496.

³ J. Lebreton, *Le Désaccord de la foi populaire*, loc. cit., p. 493.

⁴ See the *Introduction*, p. 24-25.

prices of pious study or studious prayer to which we have given this name.

The principle of the gnosis is therefore exact: there exists a knowledge of God, in the form of a prayer blessed with greater lights than those of faith. But not all the applications of this principle were so exact, i. Firstly, it was an exaggeration to insist on the gnosis as the *essential* *road to perfection*, since that is certainly charity. 2. It was also going too far to say, or give the impression, that deep *rational knowledge of God* supposes an infused light superior to that of the faith: it is possible to have such true theology and even an elevated doctrinal prayer, such as, imperfect contemplative meditation, by means of the ordinary powers of the mind, aided by ordinary grace. 3. There was a danger of letting it be thought by simple Christians, incapable of high speculation on God, that it was impossible for them to attain true perfection, when, in reality, it was within their reach through charity and [properly so-called contemplation, which is greater than the gnosis or active contemplation].*

In spite of these shortcomings, the doctrine of the gnosis had considerable advantages. 1. It made Alexandria the *intellectual focus* of the Christian East and perhaps of the whole Church. 2. It was an efficacious offset to the *heretical* which was particularly powerful in Egypt. 3. It kept within the Church many cultivated men to whom Plotinus' *Platonism* was about to offer a great temptation. 4. With Origen, Christian exegesis, with a tendency to spiritual interpretation, opposed the excessive literal tendency of the millenarianists and others. 5. *Theology* benefited the taste which the gnosis introduced for the study of the divine element in preference to any other, not only in the Scriptures but also in the Incarnate Word. Those who believed in the divinity of Christ did not come from this school. 6. Lastly, the Alexandrian teaching led to a search for the highest summits of the *Christian life*.

In the latter point of view, Clement's work had a most important and influential influence. Nevertheless it is not exempt from all criticism: a) his *mysticism* is somewhat distant; in his last miscellanies he sometimes gives exagge-

* See the *Introduction*^ p. 25.

• f.f.w.r.» vi-vii.

rated descriptions of the state of the perfect (absence of the passions, perpetual contemplation): he laid too much stress on the priesthood (metaphorical) of the gnostic; *b*) even in his ascension, or moral teaching, although it is really Christian by the place which is given to Christ as the revealer and the master, he does not perhaps attach enough importance to suffering and prayer (the latter is chiefly evident during the last stage, for the true gnostic), while on the other hand he gives too much place to philosophy; *c*) lastly, some of his teaching is slightly *esoteric*, for he took it from secret traditions instead of drawing on the official documents of the faith

All these criticisms are really grounded; Clement must be read prudently. Nevertheless these flaws do not destroy his work, nor should they be allowed to conceal much that is precious within it, both from a moral and theological point of view.

B) Theology in the Work of Clement of Alexandria.

i. Philosophy and the rule of faith. Clement, although a great moralist, was also extremely fond of philosophy. He gave to this word a *new* and twofold meaning. It is both the science of divine things and the practice of Christian life. Thus a philosopher is no other than a Gnostic or perfect man; to philosophise is synonymous with being a Christian, for "he who practises the Christian life can be a philosopher, even if he be without letters, Greek or Barbarian" 2. It should be noted that this way of thinking was common in the third century; the Pagans themselves regarded philosophy in a moral and religious light 3.

Clement did not think otherwise, and searched the early philosophers for a moral doctrine that would confirm his own. He found it in all the schools except those of Epicurus and the Sophists, whom he rejected. Hence his enthusiasm for philosophy. He thought of it as the *tutor* of the Pagans, as the Law was the *tutor* of the Jews. It is also of divine origin, not essentially and immediately (κατὰ προηγουμένον) as was the Law, but indirectly and as a result,

* J. Lebreton, *op. cit.*, p. 496-501.

* E. de Faye, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

" S. John Chrysostom speaks in the same way. See p. 486.

(κατ' ἐπακολούθημα) because reason is a gift of God and the philosophers borrowed much from the Jews. It should be used in helping the faith to become the gnosis L

Unlike the pseudo-Gnostics who substituted their dreams for the faith, Clement insisted that the faith is always the foundation (θεμέλιο) of the whole spiritual edifice. Theological speculation remains subject to the *Scriptures* (in spite of the exaggerated use of the allegorical method in his exegesis)³ and to *tradition*: the hierarchy is charged with the transmission of the "canon of the truth" or "ecclesiastical canon" ⁴.

Harnack was deceived when he thought he found in Clement's writings a Church without a hierarchy, in which the Gnostic occupied the place of the bishop: "Although philosophical principles and ecclesiastical knowledge occupy a great place in Clement's work, the structure of the faith is the same for him as for Saint Irenaeus; his Church is hierarchical and anti-heretical" ⁵.

2. Theology properly so called. We will mention only the more outstanding and the weaker points, a) God: Clement chiefly favoured *negative* theology which seeks to know the nature of God, first by excluding all corporal properties from Him, then the spiritual properties, finally coming to absolutely simple being. It may be that Clement misused this method, but it is legitimate in principle. Although he made less use of it, he also admitted *affirmative* theology, which attributes to God, analogically, positive perfections perceived in his creatures⁶.

ii) With regard to the Trinity, Photius accused Clement of admitting two Words. "But it is probable that Photius made a mistake", says Tixeront. "Clement did no more than make a distinction between immanent divine reason, attribute of the Father, and the personal Logos, who is the Son" ⁷. No doubt he attributes effects of an intellectual

¹ *Strom.*, I, 5, col. 717.

² *Strom.*, II, 2, col. 940.

³ In *Strom.*, VI, 15, 16, col. 356 sq. he explains the nature and the need of this allegorical method.

⁴ F. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 299-300.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 315. See p. 305-315.

⁶ *Strom.*, v, 12. The use of the second method is a necessary but sufficient ornament to the first.

⁷ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 286.

kind to the Son as properly belonging to Him, but at the same time he frequently affirms the unity of the divine action *ad extra*. It would seem that he was exempt from subordinationism, although a number of uneasy expressions have caused some modern critics to think otherwise; although he insists on the Word as creator, illuminator, revealer, master and tutor, he gives Him all the divine attributes in a manner which has made him suspect of modalism L

c) "Clement's doctrine on the *creation* is generally exact in spite of some traces of Plato's or Philo's teaching", remark A. de la Barre 15. He admitted neither the eternity of matter nor the pre-existence of souls 3 although the contrary has been affirmed of him. He clearly asserts the immortality of the *soul*, but trichotomy (distinction of three elements in man: body, soul and spirit) has been ascribed to him, notwithstanding some grounds 4.

d-) In his Christology, Clement allowed a certain attenuated docetism to intrude; he affirmed that Christ, in His body, was exempt from the natural needs (eating, drinking) and that His soul was free from the movements of the passions (απαθή την ψυχήν) 5. Here he applies the doctrine of the *ἀπάθεια*, with an exaggerated tendency. He admits a twofold nature and one person in the Saviour; he calls Him the Man-God 6*. The *Redemption* supposes two acts: i) redemption by blood (λύτρον), the principle of re-birth, (ἀναγέννησις) and incorruptibility (ζῆθος) 7; 2) divine education given by the Word, that is to say the providential leadership by which the Word cures and corrects souls, thus leading them to incorruptibility. This divine education culminates in the *gnosis* where the Word is the master (ὁ Διδάσκαλος) 8.

1 "Εν γὰρ ἁμφιο ὁ θεός.", *Paedag.*, I, 8, col. 325 (see also *ibid.*, col. 336,

* A. de la Barre, *op. cit.*, col. 155.

† *Strom.*, V, 14, col. 136.

* *Strom.*, vi, 6, col. 273. Unless, by spirit, he means that superior part of the soul which is characterised by a simple and intuitive action, and upon which the Spirit of Wisdom, the principle of the *gnosis*, acts immediately. See Saint Irenaeus, p. 152.

† *Strom.*, vi, 9, col. 292.

• *Paedag.*, in, I, col. 557. See also a fine passage at the beginning of the Hortatory Discourse, I, col. 61.

† *Paedag.*, in, 12, col. 664 (*Strom.*, iv, 7, col. 1256).

• *Ibid.*, I, I, col. 249-252: scheme of trilogy. See above, the nature of the *gnosis*.

¶ The sacraments 1 which are mentioned by Clement are: i; *Baptism*, which he calls a bath (λουτρῶν) or illumination (ωπισθα), the principle of re-birth 2; 2) perhaps *Confirmation* (σφραγι τοῦ Κυρίου, the seal of the Lord), which is indicated i at least a complementary rite to baptism 3; 3) The *ftid̄iarist* also accompanies baptism; Clement speaks of it, but he very often mixes mystical or symbolical speculation With real formulas, thus obscuring the sense of the latter; ¶) Lastly, *Penance*, which he regards almost in the same manner as *Hermas*, whom he quotes and with whom he lippears to admit only one forgiveness after baptism. By (he remission of sins (συγγνώμη) he means not only their pardon (ἄοεσι), but also the cure (ἰασι). He complains that ■many priests are too indulgent in according this remission. Hut in spite of his severity he thinks that murder may be a mibject of pardon, if we are to judge by the last story in the " < >uis dives salvetur",

CHAPTER III.

Origen.

I Special bibliography.

i Editions: P. G., 11-17 (Edit. *De la Rue*, 1733-1759). *Corp, merlin.*, still unfinished: t. I (1899) to 7 (1921).

Studies: F. Prat, *Origine*, in *Diet. Biblique*, col. 1870-1889; *igline* (coll. *Pensée Chrétienne*), Paris, 1907. Huet, *Origeniana* (in *I' o.*, 17). Freppel, *Origine*, Paris, 1868 (2 vol.). R. Redepenning, *i■ ones*, Bonn, 1841-1846 (2 vol.). J. Denis, *La Philosophie ^Origine*, l'iris, 1884. G. CAPITAINE, *De Origenis Ethica*, Munster, 1898. ¶ I K r des, *D'Apologétique d'Origine cfapris le Contra Celsum*, Cahors, la J. LebreTON, *Les degrés de la connaissance d'apris Origine in Jifoi. Se. Rei.*, 1922, p. 265-296, and *Le désaccord de la foi populaire et ib la théologie savante dans l'Eglise Chrétienne du IIP siècle in the A Hist. Eccl.*, 1923, p. 481-506; 1924, p. 5-37. A. d'Al ÈS, *Edit de talliste*, Paris, 1914(p. 252 and sq.). P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante...*, l' i 3 and sq.: *Etudes, Eucharistie*, p. 262-284. G. BaroY, *La Rgle Vt ia foi d'Origine*, in *Redi. Se. Rei.*, 1917. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, l' I -96-330. A. d'Al ès' criticism of E. de Faye's, *Origine*, i, Paris, [lo I, see *Rech. Se. Rei.*, 1925, p. 567-570.

' A. de la Barre, *op. cit.*, col. 184.

• *J'ucdag.*, J, 6, col. 281.

' *uis dives salvetur*, 42, col. 648.

l ■ Batiffol, *UEucharistie*, 248-261.

SECTION I. LIFE AND WORKS'.

I. ORIGEN'S LIFE AND CHARACTER.

Origen was born in Egypt, at Alexandria, probably of Christian parents, about the year 185. His father, Saint Leonides, who was his first master, not only gave him an excellent literary education but also obliged him to learn and recite passages of Holy Scripture by heart. Eusebius tells us that the child was not satisfied with the obvious sense but was ever seeking the deeper meanings. His father, the witness of this precocious genius, often came at night while his son slept, kissing his breast as if the Holy Ghost had consecrated the heart within. During the persecution of Septimius Severus, Origen would fain have shared the lot of the martyrs, so that his mother was obliged to hide his clothes in order to keep him at home. When his father was cast into prison, Origen wrote to him exhorting him to persevere courageously.

It was during this persecution that, in spite of the real risk it entailed, he took over on his own account the direction of the Didascalia which Clement had been obliged to relinquish on account of the search that was being made for him. It is doubtful whether Origen had ever followed the lessons of Pantaenus, but it is certain on the other hand that he had assisted at those of Clement. He was only eighteen years old when Bishop Demetrius appointed him to the re-opened catechetical school for the instruction of the newly converted. The Edict of Severus made new victims in the re-organised school; the young doctor educated his pupils for martyrdom; others soon took their place. Origen's unhesitating zeal soon attracted the anger of the fanatical pagans. After the persecution, other dangers threatened his youth, but he conquered them by his austere asceticism, which made of him, it has been said, "a forerunner of Antony and Hilarión". In his excessive zeal he went as far as self-mutilation, lest his duties should give rise to suspicions among his enemies. Bishop Demetrius blamed

* The chief source for Origen's life is book vi of Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* I. 6., 20, 519 and sq. Only very little of the *Apology* which the latter wrote in collaboration with Pamphilus, is now extant.

lins rash act, and for this reason always refused to onlain him priest; nevertheless, he left him at the head nl the school.

Thrust so early into the teacher's chair, Origen recognised il,, need of completing his own education. At the age of ■, (about 210) he began to follow the lessons of Ammonius Sa. cas, with the double purpose of studying the doctrines it Would be necessary for him to oppose and of rounding off his own general culture. Saccas was his true master in *Philo- typhy*: he taught Eclecticism in the school where, at a later (late, Plotinus originated Neo-Platonism. Origen also was ("..cntially an Eclectic; he was neither Stoic, nor Platonician, |lor Pythagorean. According to Gregory the Miracle- W'iker, he excluded from his scheme of study only the materialists and the atheists.

I At the same time he endeavoured to discover in Tradition tin authentic teaching of the Church. For apologetical purposes in particular, he devoted himself to critical research ini the text of the Bible. lie even learned Hebrew; some- tvhat superficially however. In 212 he made a *journey to* Rome in order to know, as he himself says, "the extremely micient Church of the Romans". It was after this that he Undertook a number of other journeys (in Greece, in Epirus, In Nicomedia, to Antioch, in Palestine and Arabia), both for |li own instruction and in response to the invitations of Britain exalted personages who wished to consult him. It bus thus that in 218, Mammea, the mother of Alexander ■nverus, made him come to Antioch to talk about the Elui tian religion. During these absences, his placeat the head of the school was taken by Heraclas, who at a later mile replaced him altogether, before becoming bishop of kl< mandria. When, in 216-218, Origen went to Palestine on ki< Hint of the disturbances and riots which had broken out Hi Alexandria under Caracalla, the bishops of Caesarea and bl Jerusalem invited him, although he was only a layman, to il>< d< in church to the catechumens and also to the faithful. Urmctrius, Bishop of Alexandria, when he learned of this, ■(•tested against the irregularity and recalled his spiritual bm. Origen obeyed at once.

I li was at this time that Origen began to write for the klliliii. His writings were many and varied. He had as ||r "I his pupils a certain *Ambrose*, whom he had converted hin years previously and who was destined to martyrdom

under Maximinus the Thracian. This man, who had enjoyed favour at the courts of Severus and Caracalla, was extremely rich; he found Origen a complete staff of stenographers and copyists and procured him the books he needed in his work. His great theological work, *Περί Ἀρχῶν* (*de Principiis*), begun in 220, was finished about 230. By this time Origen was everywhere in great repute.

This studious life was interrupted by a quarrel with his bishop. During a visit which he made to Greece and Palestine about 230, Theoctistus, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and Alexander, Bishop of Jerusalem, ordained him priest. On his return to Alexandria, Demetrius forbade him to teach and had him deposed by two synods which met at Alexandria in 231. It would seem that this sentence was confirmed by a Roman Council in 232. Demetrius charged him with breaking the laws of the Church and with holding heretical opinions, probably drawn from the *Περί Ἀρχῶν*, in which Saint Jerome certainly exaggerates when he ascribes the bishop's way of acting solely to jealousy.

Expelled from Alexandria, Origen went to Palestine, to the bishops who had ordained him. At Caesarea he founded a new theological school of which the scientific attainments surpassed even those of the Alexandrian school, and which attracted the most brilliant men of the time: Gregory Thaumaturgus, Athenodorus his brother, Firmilian of Caesarea. Origen taught here for twenty years. It will be seen here that he finished writing the *Hexapla* and the *Octapla*, enormous works of biblical criticism which he had begun at Alexandria. During this period he also undertook the refutation of the "True Word" of Celsus in his *Controverbia contra Celsum*, a work which reveals in him the soul of an apostle, preferring to do good and convert his opponent rather than score a mere controversial victory. People came from all sides to consult him on vexed doctrinal questions. To his great learning and invincible eloquence he added the charm of a sweet holiness and an astonishing asceticism.

Nor did he lack the final honour of Confessor of the Faith. During the persecution of Decius he was imprisoned and barbarously tortured, but his courage was unshaken! He survived the torture and lived on for another two or three years. He died at Tyre in 253-255. For a long time his sepulchre was visited by pilgrims, but the Church never paid him public veneration.

II. WORKS OF ORIGEN.

Origen has been called *the man of steell*, Adamantius (Ἀδαμάντιο). No other expression could so admirably describe the peculiar tenacity which the composition of the vast work he left to posterity must have entailed. Much of that work no longer remains and the title of Adamantius no longer possesses the sense given to it by Saint Jerome, a symbol of the lasting qualities of his writings. They have suffered from the conflicts to which they gave rise and many have perished because the powerful genius of the author was in reality wider than it was deep. Moreover, his *style* always shows traces of the rapid composition of his works. As a *writer*, Origen is inferior to Clement. He gave all his attention to his *matter* and gave no care to its presentation. But even his *ideas* have suffered by his hasty writing, they do not always possess the maturity, the forcefulness and precision so necessary in a literary and, above all, doctrinal work.

i Origen was the most fertile writer of the early Church, Epiphanius estimates his writings at 6.000 volumes 2: In order to explain this enormous figure we must take into account the structure of ancient libraries and the small Content of the rolls (volumina, τόμοι). Certain authors think this number to be an obvious exaggeration. The catalogue drawn up by Eusebius 3 hardly contains 2.000 titles, but it is probably incomplete. Saint Jerome's 4 list is even more incomplete, containing less than 800 works. In any case the greater part of Origen's literary work is lost, due to its vast compass and chiefly to the various condemnations which have fallen upon it. The West treated him less severely than the East, and it is only in the Latin translations of the fourth or the fifth century that a great deal of his work remains; about half of all that is extant. These translations are no poor. Saint Basil and Saint Gregory. Nazianzen have given us the very text of the great Alexandrian in the philology entitled *Philocalias*.

i Hikkon, *Ep.* XXXII, 3. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, Vi, 23.

• *Hartl.*, I x IV, 63.

• *Hist. Eccl.*, Vi, 32, 3.

• *T.N.*, *cit.*

• IS edited by A. Robinson, *The Philocalia of Origen*, Cambridge, 1893.

Origen's works fall naturally into two groups: *a) Scriptural works*; *b) theological, apologetical and ascetical works.*

A). **Scriptural works.** These are of two kinds: *critical works*: i. e. the Hexapla, and properly *exegetical works.*

I. The Hexapla (Ἑξαπλά Βιβλία), contained five different texts of the Bible (V. T.) in six parallel columns; the Hebrew text (in Hebrew letters and in Greek letters) and four Greek versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Septuagint, Theodotion). Six different translations of the Psalms formed the *Octapla*. The text of the Septuagint was marked with symbols (obelus and asterisk) to indicate the words *wanting in the Hebrew* (obelus: ζ-) or the words wanting in the Septuagint but present in another Hebrew version (asterisk: †. Two points (!) marked the end of the variant. A collection of the four Greek versions was given the name of *Tetrapla*.

Apart from the Septuagint, very little of the Hexapla remains! The original of this vast work, placed in the library of Caesarea, was used by Saint Jerome. It is very possible that the whole of it was never copied. The fifth column (Septuagint) was chiefly used. Origen himself thought this version the most valuable and preferred it to the Hebrew. This great work was begun at Alexandria and finished at Caesarea about 245. The author's aim was chiefly to enable the apologists to use the Hebrew text in their controversies with the Jews. But it was also a great contribution to exegesis, and Origen used it in his own works.

2. Origen's exegetical works are of three kinds: the *scholia*, simple philological and historical notes to throw light on obscure verses or passages; (the *stromata*, of which a few fragments are still extant, seem to have been nothing more than collections of scholia; they were youthful works containing far too much profane learning)²³ the commentaries were a well developed interpretation of the inspired text; lastly, the homilies were familiar discourses intended for the edification of the faithful; they consist of dogmatical, moral and mystical instructions drawn from Holy Scripture. Only a few fragments of this vast work remain.³

¹ Edited by MONTAUCON, Paris, 1713, and incorporated in the great edition of the Benedictines CHARLES and VINCENT de la RUE, Paris, 1733-75¹ reproduced in *I. G.*, 15-16 with this edition. New edition by FR. I-EI. II *Originis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Oxford, 1867-1875. Other fragments have been found by G. MERCATI at Milan (1895).

² F. PRAT's opinion, *op. cit.*, p. 112. It is possible to regard them as doctrinal work, similar to the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria.

³ All the exegetical works now extant may be found in *I. G.*, 12, 13, 14 III (the biblical order rather than the order of composition). To these must be added the numerous fragments assembled in *I. G.*, T7.

The *scholia* and the *commentaries*, in particular, have suffered with the passage of time. There remain only brief quotations from the *Mulinia* (σχόλια), yet it is known that Origen had composed them on the first four books of the Pentateuch, on *Isaías*, *Ecclesiastes* and the *Proverbs* (particularly the first fifteen) on two Gospels (Matthew and John), on the *Epistle to the Galatians* and the *Apocalypse*. The *commentaries*, however, were given the name of *tomes* (*libri, volumina*) on account of their number, which were also very numerous. They were written on the first four books of *Genesis* (probably 13 tomes, written before 244), on various *Psalms* (more than a third of the *Psalter*), on the *Proverbs* and the *Book of Canticles* (this was commented twice; the second time in *Matthew* 42), on nearly all the *Prophets* (*Isaías*, ch. 1-30, about 235; *Jeremiah*, *Lamentations*, before 230; *Ezekiel*, finished at Athens about 240; and the minor prophets, except *Abdias*). In the New Testament he commented all the *Gospels*, except that of *Mark*, and all *Saint Paul's Epistles* save the two to the *Corinthians* and the two to *Timothy*. *Saint Basil* took little interest in the homilies but had an unbounded admiration for the *tomes*, especially the second commentary on the *Cantic*, which he considered the author's finest work. It is due to *Saint Jerome* that the first books are still extant in Latin (1, 2, 3 and part of 4). We still have a number of more or less important fragments of the commentaries on the Old Testament (in Latin), two lengthy fragments in Greek and in Latin) of the commentaries on *Saint Matthew* (tomes 1 and 2; in Greek) and on *Saint John* (10 tomes in Greek) and the commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* (posterior to 244) in a poor translation by *Rufinus*. The other parts that are still extant are not so complete. *Origen* has fallen a victim to his exaggerated allegorical method.

The homilies have stood up better to the passage of the years. *Basil*, Origen's biographer, states that he preached nearly every day (in *De cl. pol., Praefatio*). For a long period he dictated them to his secretaries, but towards the end he wrote them himself, while he preached from the pulpit. The texts which remain are for the greater part homilies posterior to 240. Often enough they are too short to be a full summary of the author's sermon. 200 of the 500 homilies still extant are known to have been written after 240, of which 40 are on the *Prophets* of *Saint Luke* (very short; preserved in *Saint Jerome's translation* of the remainder treat of the *Old Testament*. There are too on the first four books of the Pentateuch and on *Josué*, 11 on the *Judges* and 1 on *Samuel*, of which the second (*On the Witch of Endor*, 1 *Peg.*) is particularly famous on account of the refutations to which it gave rise; it is extant in Greek. There also remain in Greek 19 homilies on *Isaías* 3; and in Latin 2 other homilies on this prophet, 14 on *Ezekiel*, 1 on *Isaías*, 2 on the *Cantic* and 9 on the *Psalms* (*Origen* preached at least 60, on 63 *psalms*). We owe the greater part of the existing text to *Origen* and *Saint Jerome*.

II The non-scriptural works deal with theology (the *De Ti incipit* alone: two books on the *Resurrection* are lost,

Translations: E. Preuschen in the *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1903.
 Edition W. A. Barrens, in *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1920-1921.
 Edition E. Klostermann, in *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1901.

except a few fragments) or with apologetics (*Contra Celsum* or asceticism (*de Oratione, de Martyrio*)).

i. *De Principiis* (Περί Ἀρχῶν) was not a youthful composition; Origen was about forty years old when he wrote it but Ambrose published it before the author had completed it. Origen was probably alluding to this writing in a letter to Pope Fabian in which he complains of his friend's indiscretion in broadcasting incomplete writings before their time. This writing became the centre of the *Origenist* controversy. It was attacked by Saint Methodius, Saint Epiphanius, Saint Jerome and Justinian, while his friends, Pamphilus, Didymus and Rufinus endeavoured to explain it in an orthodox sense. The essence of Origenism is contained in this book, in many ways the work of a genius, but possessing also a great many defects.

The entire text of this work is contained in a Latin translation by Rufinus. Unfortunately, the translation is not reliable, for Rufinus substituted orthodox passages for Origen's for others of doubtful meaning.²³ Only two large fragments in Greek are preserved in the *Philocalia*. Moreover deliberate falsifications have also corrupted the original text. In these circumstances it would now seem impossible either to condemn the *De Principiis* out of hand or to make a definite defence of it.

By the term, Principles (Ἀρχαί), Origen "means the principal articles of the teaching of the Church, upon which he always bases his speculation; and the first truths deduced from theological reasoning from revealed premisses when formal revelation has not been vouchsafed. He does not, therefore, offer us a natural philosophy, but a science consisting of rational conclusions based on revelation. In the full meaning of the word it is a *Summa Theologica* and may even be called scholastic theology"²⁴.

First of all, the *De Principiis* treats of the fundamental principles of theology in an important Prologue. It has its shortcomings no doubt, but these may be easily excused when we consider that this vast doctrinal summary was the

¹ P. G., II, 111-414. Edit. P. Koetschau, in *Coryn's* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1913. See F. Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 1-6.

² See G. Barov's thesis, *Recherches sur l'histoire du texte et des versions latines du De Principiis d'Origène*, Paris, 1923.

³ F. Prat, *op. cit.*, p. I.

⁴ See art. 111, Doctrine, p. 210.

In t to be produced in the history of the Church. The liuthor devotes four books to the subjects which were always mi infallible source of altercation for the Eastern Doctors, and « liich by their metaphysical character are sharply distinguished from the usually practical object of the common cate-thesis.

I Hook I deals with : a) the Three *Divine Persons*; the incorporeal and lin i ble Father (1), the Son, Word and Wisdom (2), the Holy Ghost, plii. is by the Son and dwells in the saints (3-4); Λ) *created spirits* (the ■cavenly angels and the infernal spirits) whose hierarchy he explains (5) I mi the variations each one of them undergoes (6) in spite of their Blgmal equality (8). Chapter 7 deals with the question of the animation ■I the stars.

I Hook II *treats of the material world and of man* : a) first, the *creation* II .l and the relations of the Three Persons with the world, notably the nriification of the God of the Old Testament with the God of the New ■I. lament (4-5) and that of the Incarnate Word with Jesus (6) that of B/r Spirit of the prophets with that of the apostles (7); b) concerning the *gtman soul*, which is studied more from a theological than from a psy-jiological point of view (8-9). In spite of the definition which he gives *tjfdstantia sensibilis*, φανταστική, *et mobilis*, ορητική), he certainly means ■In spiritual, rational soul; in fact he likens it so much to pure spirits hilt he makes play on the words ψυχή (soul), ψύχο (cold), and considers i li., being divine love cooled into the form of a spirit—just a hypothesis, MU how rash! c) chapters to and it are a summary of the author's heliatological doctrine.

■ Hook III deals with the *foundations* of morality: he writes respecti- ■lv a) of free-will, whose existence is solidly established by reason and Mt Scriptures (1); b) of the struggle with the devil (2), the world (3), the li"Ji; c) of the final victory of good over evil in the last days (4-5).

■I .itly, Book IV is wholly concerned with *Holy Scripture*, of which It. inserts the inspiration (1-7) and in which he teaches the existence of M« three senses which is the principal rule of his exegetical method ■■j). The final ten chapters are a summing up of the entire work.

I 1 Origen's most celebrated apologetical work is the ■mitra Celsum *, written between 245 and 250 to satisfy the Mr mg desire of Ambrose. Origen replies to the four books ■I risus' *True Word* in eight books which follow the work ■ (rlsus step by step. He declares, first of all, that the best ■ol.. y for Christianity is to be found in the *divine vitality* I thr Church, that is to say the strength and the force which ■tir, plays in the moral reformation of mankind, together ■III its widespread diffusion in spite of the many attacks to Kll. li it is subjected. The greater part of the work, however,

is given over to an attentive and meticulous examination of the miracles, prophecies and solemn affirmations of Jesus, for Celsus, who had studied the origins of Christianity, attacked it on all these points. Origen displays a marvellous store of learning in this book. The *firmness of his faith* is striking, as is also his calm serenity when he faces and answers his adversary's objections. Nothing remains of the other discussions which Origen had with the Jews and with various heretics.

3. Two ascetical writings of Origen are well known: the treatise *On Prayer* and the *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. a) The *De Oratione*, written after 231, is composed of two parts; the first (1-17) deals with prayer in general (nature, necessity, efficacy): the second (18-30) is a commentary on the *Pater*, one of the first ever composed [it is known that the *Pater* was again commented in the third century by Tertullian (*De Oratione*) and Saint Cyprian (*De Dominica Oratione*) and in the following century by Saint Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catechesis* 23), by Saint Gregory of Nyssa (*De Oratione Dominica*) and by Saint Augustine (*De Sermone Domini*)]. b) The *Exhortatio ad Martyrium* -, written in 235 during the persecution of Maximinus, to encourage Ambrose and a priest of Caesarea not to give way to fear in suffering in Christ, reveals all the generosity of his ardent soul. It exhorts his friends to rejoice, to jump with joy, since they have been found worthy to suffer with the Apostles.

4. Only two letters of Origen's voluminous correspondence remain: one addressed to *Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus* 3 (between 238 and 243) in which he exhorts him above all to cultivate the knowledge of the Scriptures, which should be the basis of all true knowledge; the other, to *friend Africanus* 4 (about 240), establishes the canonicity of the Greek fragments of Daniel, which were called in question at that time (Deutero-canonical books): the prayer of the young men in the furnace, III, 24-90, together with the appendix on Suzanna, XIII, and on Bel and the Dragon XIV. In this respect, the second letter is an important historical document.

¹ P. G., II, 425-562. See *ibid.*

³ P. G., II, 563-638.

³ P. G., II, 87-92.

• P. G., II, 47-86.

SECTION II.

ORIGEN'S DOCTRINAL METHOD.

Origen was a true master: he founded a school which flourished many hundreds of years. It is therefore of the highest importance to know something of his doctrinal method.

It is best characterised by his exegesis, but in order that this may be well understood it is necessary, first of all, to consider the principles on which it is based and which animate the whole. In this section we will deal respectively with: 1. Origen's mystical tendency; 2. his attachment to the rule of faith and the use to which he put philosophy; 3. lastly, his exegesis.

I. MYSTICAL TENDENCY.

Like his master, Clement of Alexandria, Origen was a mystic. Not only was he gifted with the *superior* infused contemplation, but he also reserved a large place in his method for those lights which the Holy Ghost vouchsafes in the *perfect Christian*. He did not speak of the *gnosis* to the same extent as Clement had done, for the term had come to be looked on with suspicion; but he devoted a great deal of his teaching to the preparation and the utilisation of that supernatural learning which distinguishes the more perfect Christian from the common run.

The immediate object of these lights are the *divine mysteries*, which, although not completely unveiled, are at least illuminated. They enable God to be known in the wisdom of God (I *Cor.* I, 21), which the world has been incapable of realising. The dogma of the *Trinity*, which is an object of faith for every Christian, is also found at the limit of this illumination of the soul by grace. But it is especially with regard to *Christ* that the difference between the faith of *simple* and men of *enlightened* faith may be discerned; 4

¹ J. Lebreton, *Les degrés de la connaissance religieuse d'après Origène*, *cit.*, 265 and sq.

² *contra Cels.*, I, 13, *P. G.*, II, 679.

³ *In Exm.*, v, 3; *P. G.*, 12, 452; *In Psalm XXVI*, 6: Porro is videt jucunditatem Domini qui fundamentalia Ecclesiæ dogmata intuetur: Trinitatis vero divinitatem ita considerans, templum ejus contemplantur; *P. G.*, 12, 1279. See also Lebreton, *ibid.*, p. 277-278.

⁴ *bi Ioann.*, I, 9, II, 3. *P. G.* 14, 36-37; 113.

the former see only the humanity and the humility of the Word, and especially His sufferings, while the latter uncover His divinity and are not content with the first aspect. The former have faith without knowledge, and their faith is weak. The latter add to their faith that knowledge of God which is the base of theological learning.

All these assertions, which may be found in various forms in many of the Fathers, and notably in Saint Augustine often enough become *objects of suspicion in Origen* on account of his unguarded way of stating them. The enthusiast's ardour which moves him to lead souls to the peak of his spiritual life sometimes seems to make him depreciate simple uncultured Christians, whose faith he even likens to that of the Jews. It is true of course that to Origen's mind every Christian can, and should progress, from simple faith to knowledge and is only deprived of the latter by his own fault: the severity of the doctrine which he teaches is thus singularly attenuated. While on the subject of Christ, Origen makes too great an opposition between the two kinds of knowledge, that of His human nature and that of His divine nature, and does not show sufficiently that the desire of contemplating *Christ*, far from excluding His human nature should rather draw the soul to a consideration of it: he supposes this no doubt, but he says it less clearly than Saint Bernard who distinguishes spiritual love from sensibly love, or Saint Teresa exhorting contemplatives to the worship of Our Saviour's humanity. He appears to make too great a distinction between knowledge and faith, as though the latter could be replaced by the former. Lastly, like Clement, he attributed, in his idea of perfection, too much importance to *rational and discursive* knowledge of the mysteries, as if perfection were meant to be given to every soul in this manner. These excesses, which are explained by the strong convictions and apostolic zeal of the author, are all due to his ardour in defending the Church against the accusations of ignorance, with which Celsus and the Gnostics charged the orthodox Christians.

1 See *Contemplation Augustinienne*, ch. V.

2 In *Maith.*, XII, 15; *P. G.*, 13, 1017. See J. Lebréton, *ibid.* p. 251.

3 S. Bernard, *In Cantic.*, Sermon, xiv, 6.

4 *Interior Castle*, VIth Mansion, ch. 7.

5 J. Lebréton, *op. cit.*, 266-270.

(Origen has at least shown that these superior lights have their source in God. "No one may understand the meaning of the Gospel (of Saint John, which is wholly concerned with Christ's divinity) if he has not rested on the breast of Jesus and received Mary from Jesus, to be his mother and his teacher." Mary's spiritual maternity is clearly taught here, but it is reserved (no doubt in all its plenitude) to the perfect Christian in whom Jesus lives perfectly. The Word reveals Himself to the perfect, when and as He desires. He it is Who educates souls in the knowledge of Christ, as He had done for the Apostles. Father Lebreton observes that the stages in which Origen describes this gradual education of the Apostles by Christ, should be numbered amongst the finest and most profound of all Patristic Exegesis. In many ways they resemble the Tutor of Saint Clement of Alexandria.

I As we have already considered, the *objects* which are *illuminated* by these superior lights are first *God*, then the *Olivine Persons* and *Christ*. These lights also fall to a great extent on *Holy Scripture*. This notion rightly enters, in a certain measure, into Origen's *mystical exegesis*; for only those who possess a pure and elevated idea of God can understand the books which treat of God and contain His word. Unfortunately, Origen was unable to keep within limits. He extended this light to all manner of *secondary facts*, such as numbers and figures, the knowledge of which is more satisfying to curiosity than to true devotion. II' thus ran the risk of diminishing religious life in his principles and of finding doctrines in Holy Scripture which were either not strictly in accordance with faith or even contrary to it. This danger was rendered even more grave by the fact that Origen pretended to have learned many points of his doctrine by means of a secret teaching. It may be of course, that this *esotericism* was no more than the means of attaining that source of superior light, which consists in faith and charity, by means of traditional Christian mysticism. Nevertheless, Father Lebreton thinks that he

I | I Joann., I, 6, P. G., 14, 32.

I | In Matth., XII, 15-20. P. G., 13, 1016-1020.

I * Olt. cit., 287.

I | The Word is the *Tutor*, the *Master* of the Christian. See above, p. 181, In: *Tutor (Paedagogus)* Bk. I.

I | I.F.BRKTON, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

meant more than that, and there are many texts to support his opinion ¹. Origen's attachment to official *tradition*² however, must not be forgotten, for that, as we shall see, was his great doctrinal rule.

II. FAITH AND REASON IN ORIGEN'S METHOD.

A) Attachment to faith and tradition a. Like the true Doctor that he was, Origen insisted especially on the magisterium of the Church, whose teaching is at the base of all his theology. His first doctrinal rule is as follows: nothing must be received as an article of faith which differs from ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition, such as has been transmitted since the Apostles through the channels of lawful succession, and such as is actually preserved in the Church. He unceasingly repeats the words *ecclesiastical preaching* (κήρυγμα ἐκκλησιαστικόν), *ecclesiastical teaching* (δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν λόγος), *ecclesiastical rule offaith* (δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανὼν)³. In this he resembles Saint Irenaeus. He saw the faith not only in the canon of the inspired writings, but also in the teaching of the Church which interprets them. Ecclesiastical is often synonymous with apostolical in the work of Origen ⁴.

Moreover, few writers have laid greater stress on the principle of authority in the Church ⁵. All the essential features of Catholicism are to be found in Origen; a hierarchical society with three degrees, ruled by the bishop (sometimes, however, he seems to subordinate excessively the powerful order, to holiness in the minister)⁶. The divine teaching which is entrusted to the Church is transmitted by the living magisterium of the "Doctores Ecclesiae"⁷ (bishops and priests) and the bishops are the final judges of it. Here, of course, Origen's theology is incomplete. The "De Prim

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 287-294. See also the same author, *Le désaccord de la foi populaire et de la théologie savante dans l'Eglise Chrétienne du III^e siècle*, p. 504 (A>μ, *Hist. Eccl.*, 1923).

² See G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, I, p. 162-196.

³ *De Principiis*, 1, 2, 5, 6, 7. *In Jerem.*, v, 14.

⁴ The two terms are found together in the following passage: "ilia sola nō danda est veritas quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditional *De Principiis*, I, 2.

⁵ P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 358-397.

⁶ With regard to penance: it is not certain, however, that this particular text is to be taken in an unrestricted sense. See below Sect. II, § n, p. 215.

⁷ *In Rom.*, II, 11; *P. G.*, 14, 897. *In Ezech.*, II, 2; *P. G.*, 13, 682.

ipii " does not treat *ex professo* of the Church. The Roman Primacy is not specially mentioned, but the author's allegorical interpretation of the " tu es Petrus " "all the imitators of Christ bear the name of Peter"; is not an argument against it

In spite of the use that heretics have made of his works, it is quite certain that Origen himself was not a heretic even if he was expelled from Alexandria for doctrinal reasons. Saint Jerome is not consistent when he attributes the violence of Demetrius entirely to jealousy. It is certain in any case that all the Eastern Bishops except those in Egypt believed in Origen's orthodoxy and even considered him as the *staunchest champion of the faith*. They all consulted him as an oracle. It is usual to cite the incident of Beryllus of Postra, a Patripassian Unitarian whom he converted and whose friendship and confidence he won, " a rare outcome to a theological discussion ", as Fr. Prat remarks. Origen erred at times; but he was not stubborn. " A heretic is made of obstinacy and pride. One cannot read Origen's works without being struck by his modesty, his reserve and his candour"⁰.

B) Philosophy. Origen's method makes a large use of philosophy. But its importance should not be magnified. Origen was far from sharing Clement's enthusiasm for the old writers. He was rendered, as J. Tixeront³ remarks, " profoundly philosophical by the cast of his studious and inquiring mind, his love of speculation and the audacity with which he applied the reasoning faculties to supernatural problems. But he was not bound down to a system. Like his master, Ammonius Saccas, he was an eclectic. " It is impossible to comprehend anything of Origen's theories if he is regarded as being bound to any particular school; the chief fault of Origenism, in its various forms, has been its attempts to find in his writings a logical and exhaustive development of a philosophical system "⁴. A. Denis, a non-Catholic writer, has made the following observation: " I do not believe that Origen found any of his essential principles in Greek learning. He would have had the same ideas even

¹ *in Matth.*, Xu, 10; *P. G.*, 13, 907. See Batiffol, *Op. cit.*, p. 391-393.

² Prat, *op. cit.*, p. xxxiv-xxxix. See also G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 162-170.

³ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 302.

⁴ Prat, *op. cit.*, p. xm-xiv.

had he not known the Stoics and Plato. But it is true that he often took from the latter the dress in which his ideas are clothed ... he certainly made use of Greek philosophy for the better expression of his doctrines... But as for the ideas themselves, I think that their source must be sought elsewhere"'. That source is chiefly Holy Scripture. He made of philosophy a tool, and, as we shall see, he did not always use it as prudently as he might have done.

III. ORIGEN'S EXEGESIS.

A) Principles of Origenist Exegesis. Origen and his method are best characterised by his exegesis. He was essentially an exegete and only secondarily a philosopher, theologian and mystic. As an exegetist he is noteworthy for his allegorical method. For a better understanding of the latter, it is necessary to note Origen's classification of the various biblical senses, which has been used by a great number of the Fathers.

i. General notion of the biblical senses. Origen found three different senses in the Bible: *a)* the *corporal* sense, which is, as it were, the *body* of the Scriptures; *b)* the *psychic* signification, which is the soul of the Scriptures; *c)* lastly, the *spiritual* sense, corresponding to the spirit in man and containing the shadow of the things to come². This division is based on the Platonic trichotomy and especially on Origen's mystical teaching, according to which, Christians are divided into three classes: simple Christians; those who advance in the way of perfection; and, finally, perfect Christians³. To each of these classes one of the above senses is particularly suited. That, in all probability, is the immediate foundation of the great Alexandrian's theory.

The idealist tendency should also be noted. As a general rule the *psychic sense* occupies but a minor place. It is vaguely synonymous with the moral sense, but it often disappears entirely and is absorbed in the spiritual sense. Even considered in itself, it only possesses a very mode.¹

¹ A. DENIS, *La Philosophie d'Origène*, Paris, 1884, p. 59-60.

² *De Principiis*, IV, 11.

³ *De Principiis*, *ibid.*

* F. Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

intermediary function between the two extremes with which Origen is chiefly preoccupied. In his mysticism he is easily led to oppose *simple* to *perfect* Christians; similarly in his exegesis he opposes the *letter* to the *spirit*, the *corporal sense* to the *spiritual sense*. And moreover, the latter of these two terms becomes so important that it would seem that the former did not count. That, precisely, is the effect of allegorism.

2. "Allegorism", says Fr. Prat, "is more of a tendency than a method. It is a tendency to substitute a metaphor or a symbol for the proper sense, to add to the natural sense an arbitrary accommodation drawn from some remote analogy, and to give to the literal sense what purports to be a spiritual sense, authorised by neither the Church nor tradition"

The fundamental theory of his exegesis² was the distinction of these three senses in the Scriptures. This theory can well be defended if it is considered only from the point of view of the *objects signified*, which, in point of fact, are either historical, moral or theological. But the author did not limit himself to this; he mixed his frames of reference, and passed from the object itself to the way in which it is signified³ at the risk of causing most serious misconceptions. We will not dwell on the *psychic* sense on which Origen laid but little stress. The corporal sense sometimes indicated historical facts, sometimes the letter of the Scriptures, or the literal sense or rather a kind of literal sense, i. e., the *proper* sense; Origen regarded metaphors as being contained in the spiritual sense, since he made a copious use of them for doctrinal, theological and mystical purposes. This enables us to understand his strange assertion that many parts of Scripture have no *corporal* meaning; he did not exclude all literal meanings, which would have been absurd, but only the proper literal sense⁴.

The spiritual senses wholly pervades Origenist exegesis. If we look at it from the point of view of the *mode of signi-*

² F. Prat, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

³ *De Principiis*⁴ IV, 11; *P. G.*, II, 364-365. In *Levity* v, 1, 5; *P. G.*, 12, 417. 455.

⁴ See (lie *General Introduction.*, p. 28.

⁵ *De Principiis*, IV, 15-19.

⁶ *De Principiis*⁴ IV, 8 sq. In *Num.*, bom. XI (of the First-fruits), 1-5; *P. G.*, 19, 640-651.

fication, which is that of modern exegetes, this sense embodied: *a*) the metaphorical literal sense; the typical sense; *c*) all the accommodative senses that can be added thereto. But Origen regarded it nearly always from the *point of view of the object*. Thus, for him, the spiritual sense sometimes meant all the doctrinal senses, including the moral sense, which elsewhere he calls the psychic sense. More often the spiritual sense means all the *theological doctrinal senses*, directly or indirectly contained in the Scriptures, which concern God, Christ and future life. And above all, it means the various *accommodations* which can be made oil the historical passages, either by making use of *metaphors* which supplement, or take the place of, the proper literal sense, or by taking the historical facts as *symbols* of other things. It is this exegetical method which has been given the name of allegorism.

An allegory is a developed metaphor, for instance the allegory of the vine in Isaias (V, 1-6). At Alexandria, this name was given, by analogy, to all the various *types* and *symbols* which are contained in the Old Testament, and which represent some aspect of the New. Moreover, nearly everything which is found in the Scriptures was used to signify or explain the highest truths of religion; God and the Divine Persons, Christ and His Church, etc. God Himself has vouched for the meaning of some of these types and symbols, but the greater number are arbitrary inventions of Origen, based on some far-fetched metaphor or analogy. The name of *allegorism* was given to the system as a whole. To *allegorise* means a broad interpretation which quickly departs from the letter in order to rise to a spirit having but a tenuous connection with the letter. The Pagan philosopher! (the Stoics in particular), and especially Philo, were the pioneers of this exegetical method. Nevertheless Origen did not depend on them. It would seem that he was wholly taken up with the advantages he found in this method, and in no way preoccupied with its dangers*.

B) Advantages and dangers of the method Origen's study of Platonic philosophy, and still more the deep-seated desires of his mystical soul, had given

* @ce Λ' I>R0T' (in *ŷtæuvre extgitiqiu de Théodore de Mofsueste*, RomeJ 1913), *The beginnings of allegorism*, see p. 4-12.

mi an extremely *elevated idea of God*. It was in continence of this that his great, and we may say only, ii' in exegesis was to interpret the Scriptures in a way .Inch would be worthy of Him, excluding everything which un ht tend to diminish this idea >. Moreover, this idea >| God was rendered concrete and animated by *symbols*, ,hile the transcendency which becomes His infinite sover- li;nty was in no way destroyed. Lastly, the highest nuns of the spiritual life greatly benefited by this method. V' can easily understand from this, why Origen was so ttached to his method. He rebuffed his adversaries Indignantly, says Fr. Lebreton; " he was not only a scholar Mending his exegetical methods; he was above all a << >|ly religious man defending what he held to be most in red">8. In these circumstances it is not difficult to lliiderstand the *enthusiasm* which such principles aroused his young and ardent disciples. But even that only leased the dangers.

These dangers were only too real 3. They were chiefly he outcome of two causes: *a*) the fact that Origen often (mud texts in the Bible which he considered would be ■rogatory to God if they were explained in a literal sense; lliile the supposed spiritual sense which he gave to them |nl only, in many cases, did not depend on the letter of the lliiptures, but *frequently set it aside*; *b*) he presented *all various forms of the spiritual sense* we have mentioned, i- being the *word of God*, even in the case of very broad itiinmodations, based on textual imperfections in the h'plugint, and grammatical errors. With such a system, I was only too easy to make God responsible for the liuiigest doctrines, and compromise the faith. This peril Vir. redoubled by the fact that Origen, like the philosopher u- was, did not only content himself with simple belief, nil also explained it by reason; consequently his daring l) > illations did not apply a sufficient brake to the vehemence |l his allegorical exegesis. He thus crippled to a large ■but his doctrinal influence, which in many ways bore the kds of greatness.

1 FRAT, *Op. cit.*, p. XVIII.

1 LKBRETON, *Le désaccord de la foi populaire et de la théologie savante*, l' *Hist. Eccl.*, 1923, p. 506.

1 FRAT, *op. cit.*, p. XVIII, and p. 136 and sq.

SECTION III. ORIGEN'S DOCTRINE.

I. GENERAL SURVEY OF ORIGEN'S THEOLOGY.

Origen found all his doctrine in the Scriptures (or, at least, thought he did) and based it on the traditional rule of faith. But he did not come to a halt there. He realised that a believer, armed with philosophy, can go yet further and discuss, in the light of revealed truths, many problems which are not explicitly solved by faith; such is the very object of theology. He was therefore the first to endeavour to draw up a list of *revealed truths*, the object of the faith which the Apostles had judged necessary to be taught to all, "*manifesta praedicatione*", even to the *pigriores*, in order that he might distinguish them from *controversial matter* of religious subjects. The latter forms the object of theological research and free opinions of the "*studiosiores*" and theological speculation. *Faith* attains the objective content of revealed truths (*quia sint*); whilst *theology* deals with the cause and mode of these truths (*quomodo aut unde* ó/w/i "Ecclesiastical preaching" sets the limits to the object of faith; everything outside these limits is the object of theology'.

The Prologue of the *De Principiis* contains the *darin* distinctions on which Origen based theology. These gave an excellent promise, but unfortunately the working out of his system contained many defects. "Origen's theological system was based on excellent premisses, but his powerful mind was incapable of confining itself to their limits, with the result that, together with many exact and profound conclusions, we find a number of rash conjectures and inadmissible assertions" 2. In this respect the list of questions left to the free discussion of theologians, which is given in the Prologue, is very significant 3.

1. Is the Holy Ghost engendered or not? Is He the Son of God? 4

2. Is the soul *ex seminis traduce*, created *ex nihilo*, or pre-existent? 5

1 *De Principiis*, I, *Prol.*, 2-3; *P. G.*, II, 115-117.

2 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 329.

3 *De Principiis*, I, *Prol.*, 4, 10; *P. G.*, II, 117-121.

4 *Ibid.*, 4.

5 *De Principiis*, 5.

What existed before the creation of the world? 1

II Are God and the spirits incorporeal? (ἀσώματα) 2.

When were the angels created? What are they? Are devils fallen angels? 3

I 6. Are the stars animated or not? 1

I Since Origen's theological writings were established on biblical principles they were necessarily very complex and varied. We will deal, in the first place, with the most unstable, or rather, the more contested points of his doctrine, before passing on to the more important among his others.

III OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF ORIGEN'S THEOLOGY.

I A Defective teaching concerning the Trinity and the Son.

I His doctrine of the Trinity is perhaps not so erroneous as has sometimes been supposed. With regard to the Words, Origen clearly affirms that: i) He is essentially God, therefore He should be called θεός and not δ θεός, which is a title reserved to the Father, who was not engendered; ii) He is the same substance as the Father, engendered in a filial manner, as an act of will, is produced by the soul; iii) lastly, He is eternal, for "non erat quando non erat". All these assertions are an anticipatory refutation of Arianism. If the text is authentic, it may be that Origen was the first to use the word δμοούσιος in speaking of the Son, of whose generation he says "aporhœa gloriæ omnipotentis pura et libera". When speaking of the Holy Ghost, Origen speaks of His mediate emanation from the Father by the Spirit (ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, per) as one of the characters which distinguish His manner of His procession from that of the Son; but he ascribes all the divine attributes to the Holy Ghost. The earliest Eastern tradition was acquainted with the two

ititi., 7.

ititi., 8, 9.

thnl., 10, 6.

Ititi., 10.

Uni., I, ch. 2, 1-13; In Joann., passim.

/» Joann., II, 2.

/N Principiis IV, 28.

In Roïn., I, 5; P. G., 14, 848.

/» Ileb., (fragm. ex Apoi. Pamphili pro Origene) P. G., 14, 1308.

/» Principiis, I, ch. 3, 1-8, chiefly 3, 4.

doxologies: *Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto*, which was adopted at Nicaea, and *Gloria Patri per Filium in Spiritu Sancto*, which was more usual in the beginning and more adapted to Origenist theology, although it did not contain all the implications which the Arians attributed to it.

Nevertheless, Origen's Trinitarian theology contains many weaknesses: 1) the terminology is inconstant: οὐσία ordinarily means nature, but ὑποστάσις, which is often synonymous with οὐσία, is elsewhere taken in the sense of person. 2) through fear of Modalism, he insists excessively on the reality of the Persons and goes to the other extreme, employing the expression "three ὑποστάσεις", which is ambiguous although he was careful never to say three οὐσῆαι; 3) in speaking of the Son he employs certain ill-sounding expressions (Ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς, δεύτερο θεός), which may be excusable perhaps, but are nevertheless dangerous, for they reveal Origen's tendency to establish some kind of hierarchy among the Divine Persons. He went as far as making a system of this hierarchy, sometimes giving it a metaphysical character (the Father represents absolute unity; the Son is the principle of multiplicity), sometimes a religious character (certain prayers should be addressed only to the Father; they are transmitted to Him through the Son and the Holy Ghost, through Whom the Christian is raised up to the Father). It should be remarked, however, that this inferiority of the Holy Ghost and the Son seems to reside less in the Divine life itself than in the ministerial attributes ascribed to Them in this life. Origen speaks as a philosopher (when explaining the origin of the world) and as a mystic (when explaining the union with God) at the same time as he speaks as a theologian. This complexity of view-point probably misled a number of inattentive disciples, with the result that a definite subordinationism was attributed to him, which in reality is less than he intended. His attachment to tradition and his mystical sense kept Origen and his great disciples within the bounds of orthodoxy, especially as regards the Divine

* J. Lebreton, *Disaccord...* *loc. cit.*, 1924, p. 27-28.

† G. Bardy, *Didyme l'aveugle*, Paris, 1910, p. 63-64.

‡ *in Joann.*, II, 2. See J. Lebreton, *op. cit.*, 16-17.

• *De Orat.*, XV, XVI; *P. G.*, II, col. 464 sq.

§ See above, p. 109 (Doctrine of the Apologists) and p. 172 (The Christian doctrinal environment in the third century).

nl Christ. Such powerful influences for good were sometimes lacking in the School of Antioch.

2). Origen's great error, the "radical flaw" in his system, is the theory of successive trials, together with all its ramifications'. 1. Like Clement he corrected the current belief in (he eternity of matter, by the doctrine of the *creation ab aeterno* of spirits, and of matter by concomitance, since matter exists only for the spiritual. 2. This error led to another; he argued thus: if from all eternity the fate of souls has not yet been decided, will it ever be, especially if these pre-existent souls are endowed with activity and consciousness? Hence the theory of *successive trials*. 3. This called for another theory of the *original equality of spirits*, as an offset to the Gnostic dualism of souls. He explains the present differences between intelligent spirits from their different use of free will.

It follows from this that reasoning natures will never be *definitely rooted* either in good or evil, but will undergo an Indefinite series of transformations. Nevertheless, Origen liade a number of *exceptions* which were imposed by faith; certainly the soul of Christ, probably the souls of devils, and tn (asionally the souls of the reprobate and the elect. But Un se theories did not hinder Origen from admitting elsewhere³, that all intelligent beings would finally return to friendship with God. This is the universal restoration (ἀποκατάστασι πάντων) which would seem to be in contradiction with the preceding theories. But in these matters Uc must not endeavour to give to the author's ideas a unity which probably never existed; nor must we forget that he |>it forward many of these doctrines in the shape of *con-*
titutes.

This universal restoration is the weaker part of Origenist Eschatology, which in many ways is excellent. Origen's Ipiritual exegesis, for instance, dealt a great blow to *Mille-*
tarianism. Moreover, he admitted the resurrection of the body, and the identity of the glorified body with that of the |'n ent life, due to the corporeal form which persists through idi change. The bodies of the just will be, as it were, spiri-
Kiidised. The bodies of the wicked will suffer the pain of

1 Prat, *op. cit.*, p. xxvin-xxxm, and p. 68-109.

/c- *Principiis*, III, V, 4; col. 328 sq.

/r- *Principiis*, III, vi; col. 333 sq.

fire, a fire which it seems is also spiritualised and which is destined to be quenched at the coming of the Apocatastasis¹,

B). Other theological questions. We will deal only with those that have been influenced by one or other of the preceding theories, or have some other claim to special importance.

1) All men have sinned, even the day-old infant; hence the necessity of baptism. Origen is very sure of himself when dealing with the *fact* of original sin, but he hesitates when treating of its *nature*. Sometimes he regards it as a sin committed by souls while they were still spirits, while at other moments he declares it to be the fact of the soul's union to a sullied body, descended from the sinner, Adam J. I

2) In common with other souls, the *soul of Christ* was created from all eternity, but it has always remained faithful to God. By the Incarnation, the Word was more closely united to it, and through it became united to the body. In spite of these theories, Origen just saved himself from Docetism. He admitted the integrity of the two natures and the unity of the Person. His Christology is quite orthodox. He explains the *Redemption* either by the juridical theory of the rights of the devil, to whom Christ gives his soul as our ransom⁴, or by the traditional theory of the satisfaction of a propitiatory sacrifice⁵. Moreover, the Redemption is *universal* and even extends beyond the limits of mankind.

3) Grace is a great help to man. Origen, who laid such stress on free will⁷, found a way of showing the universal necessity of Grace. The good which is in us cannot exist without the help of God, but the latter is not vouchsafed independently of our own activity and efforts. Thus, everything depends at the same time on God and on man, who in the accomplishment of a good action are joined together to the extent of forming but a single intelligence: *duobus unus effici debeat intellectus*⁸.

¹ F. Prat, *op. cit.*, 87-98. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 325-329.

² *In Rom.*, V, 9; *A. G.*, 14, 1047. See also *In Levit.*, viii, 3; *P. G. u.*, 494-496.

³ J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, p. 133-141 and 377-381.

⁴ *In Maith.*, xvi, 8; *P. G.*, 13, 1397.

⁵ *In Joann.*, xxviii, 14; *p. G.*, 14, 719-724.

⁶ *In Joann.*, I, 40; *P. G.*, 14, 93.

⁷ *He Principiis*, III, 1; *De arbitrii libertate*, 1-22, col. 249-303.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 22; col. 301.

4) Sin is remitted chiefly by baptism (ἀφεσι ἁμαρτιῶν). There is also a *cure* (ἰασι) for subsequent faults, to be obtained either by martyrdom, or by almsgiving, the forgiveness of wrongs, zeal for the conversion of sinners, the love of God, and, lastly, penance. Origen's teaching on the last-mentioned is especially valuable. It may be summed up as follows: 2 a) the *power of* remitting sins belongs "to those who preside in the Church," to the bishops. b) In theory, *all the sins* of every *sinner* can be forgiven, c) In order to obtain forgiveness the sinner must first of all *confess* his guilt, in secret, either to the bishop, or to a priest, who decides whether it is necessary for him to perform public penance, d) There are two kinds of grave sins; the three *crimina mortalia*, which necessitate public penance and can only be pardoned once by the Church; the *culpae mortales* which can be purged by private satisfaction and may be remitted more than once, e) The *minister* must be worthy; although the absence of this condition does not take away from him all power of absolving, it deprives him of that moral influence which is so necessary for the proper restoration of the sinner to the state of grace. These principles suffice to explain the majority of Origen's texts concerning penance, and even the well-known text from the *De Oratione* 5, Which, of course, must certainly be interpreted by other and mostly later texts.

5) Origen made an allegory of the Eucharist as he had made allegories of the text of the Scriptures. It would have been surprising had he not done so. Nevertheless he did not limit the Eucharist as a pure allegory; he kept to true Christian tradition by admitting the *reality* of the presence of the Body of Christ. He taught that the Eucharistic service was a true *sacrifice*; Christian altars are consecrated

¹ The distinction to be made between these two expressions is important. It explains the various passages in which Origen would seem to deny that sins Unlimited after baptism cannot be pardoned, for instance *In Joann.*, II, 6, *lfti* XXVIII, 13.

See A. D'Arts, *Edit de Calliste*, Paris, 1914, p. 252-296; J. TIXERONT, *L' Srmement de Pénitence dans l'antiquité chrétienne*, Paris, 1914; and *Hist. Lw.*, i, p. 318-321.

* *in Psalm*, XXXVII, hom. II, 6; *P. G.*, 12, 1386. See also *Psalm.*, XXXVI, Mun. I, 5. *In Lenii.*, II, 4; V, 3.

¹ *In Lcvit.*, hom. xv, 2; *P. G.*, 12, 560.

[* *Oral.*, xxyiii; *P. G.*, 11, 528, 529. Father n'Aifcs gives a very Millhving explanation of this difficult text. For a contrary rendering, however, L l Cavaiera in *Bull. Litt. Ecd.*, 1923, p. 172-181.

by the Precious Blood of Christ (*pretioso sanguine Christ! consecrari*) l.

6) For Origen's teaching on the Church, see above, p. 204,

III. SPIRITUAL DOCTRINE.

A). Origen's mystical teaching has already been partly explained, for it influences the whole of his doctrine inasmuch as it is the core of his method. He conceives perfection as wisdom, the gift of the Holy Ghost 2³ shedding greater light on God and on Christ, as well as on the Holy Scriptures, of which it gives a more profound knowledge (spiritual sense). But perfection is more than wisdom; above all it is in *charity*, which creates a spiritual union between God and the soul, similar to that which marriage creates between husband and wife 3. Lastly, the perfect Christian has complete control of his *passions* 4.

B). The Ascension or *ascetic method*, which leads to perfection, comprises several *degrees*.

1). In the passage regarding the passions 5, Origen distinguishes three stages in the way of perfection: the *beginners* in whom the passions commence to lose their force; those who are *making progress*, in whom the passions are dying out under the grace of the Holy Ghost; and lastly, the *perfect*, Origen, of course, insists especially on the two extremes, but often enough he speaks of the intermediary term, the Christians who, having gone beyond the *corporeal sense* of the Bible, understand the *moral* or *psychic* sense and will soon comprehend the *spiritual sense* 6. Thus it is that the believer is elevated by the Holy Ghost from *faith* to knowledge, before coming to *wisdom* and the *gnosis* 7.

2). As regards the best means for making progress in the way of perfection, Origenist asceticism would seem to favour the following: 1. keeping the commandments and practising

1 In lib. /esu Nave, h. η, I; A G., 12, 533. See P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistia* p. 262-284.

« *Contra Cels.*, VI, 13; *I. G.*, II, 1309.

3 See the entire Commentary *In Cant. Cant.*, chiefly in the *Prologue*, *P. G.*, 13, 64-75.

4 In *Rom.*, horn. VI, 14; *P. G.*, 14, 1101-1102.

3 In *Rom.*, hom. VI, 14; A G., 14, 1102.

• See above, p. 207.

• *Contra Cels.*, VI, 13.

the virtues (as indicated by the *psychic sense* of the Scriptures); 2. *continence*, which Origen never ceases to recommend, both by his example and his teaching; 3. the study of Our Lord's humanity, especially in His Passion; 4. docility to the action of Christ, Who educates the Christian interiorly, as He had educated the Apostles; 5. faithfulness to the guidance of the Holy Ghost, by Whom we are able to reach Christ and, through Him, the Father; 6. prayer; 7. meditation and contemplation, which are best accomplished in solitude. It was this reason that led Saint John the Baptist to go into the desert "*ubi purior aer erat, et cælum apertius et familiar* U)eus" 4.

IV. ORIGENISM s.

A). The beginning's of Origenism. This word, Origenism, has taken on a *pejorative sense* and means a doctrinal system which is especially characterised by its insistency on the weaker parts of Origen's teaching, notably the pre-existence of souls, the spiritual nature of glorified bodies and the apocatastasis. It was finally condemned by the Church. These errors, however, did not become widespread until long after Origen's death. Origen had an *enormous* influence both in the East and in the West. In many ways it was a *pre'd influence*, not only on account of its opposition to the literal grossness of the Millenarianists or the Anthropomorphites⁶, but also by its positive aspect: he was "the true Hounder of scientific Greek theology", even although he occupied this place rather as "a theological pioneer" and "a sower of ideas"⁷ than as a master of the subject. Moreover, his influence was, for a long period, quite *peaceful*, since Origen's admirers had the sense to keep his risky hypotheses in the background.

At the *end of the third century*, Origen was surrounded by friends. His first disciples were Gregory Thaumaturgus and theilian of Caesarea. In Egypt, those who succeeded him but the Didascalia, Dionysius of Alexandria, Theognostes and

⁴ In *Maith.*, xti, 15-20; *P. G.*, 13, 1013-1030. See above, p. 203.

⁵ See above, Trinitarian teaching, p. 212.

⁶ See in particular the *De Oratione*.

⁷ *hi Lue.*, hom. XI; *P. G.*, 13, 1827.

⁸ See A. d'Alès, *Originisme*, in *Did. AJoi.*, col. 1228-1258.

⁹ I. KEBRETON, *Le Disaccord...*, *op. cit.*, 1924, p. 33-34.

¹⁰ Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 330.

Pierius, acknowledged him as their master, as also at a later date did Athanasius and Didymus. "During the *whole of the fourth century*, Origen's work was a public quarry, in which everyone freely took what materials he wanted, often enough without taking the trouble of re-shaping them... Long, unacknowledged quotations were part of the literary manners of the period. And at that time, books of theology and exegesis were regarded as the common stock of the Church in which everyone had the right to dip" ¹. The East did not hesitate to do so, nor the West, represented by such men as Saint Hilary, Ambrose, Eusebius of Vercelli, and above all Rufinus. Saint Jerome, who declared that he was shocked by these *thefts (furta Latinorum)*, committed more than anyone else, and as an excuse he modestly confessed that he did but follow "the man who pleases all wise men" ².

Given the complicated character of Origen's work, such widespread popularity had its dangers. These originated especially with the "fanatical admirers", who "exaggerated his more daring ideas, turned his hypotheses into dogmas, and, paying no heed to the progress that Catholic theology! had made from age to age, created *Origenism*. This anomalous system wandered along various paths and in the sixth century finally arrived at a kind of nihilist pantheism" ³. ¹

B) The Origenist controversies to which these excesses gave rise were not continual. They broke out suddenly after long periods of truce and calm. Nevertheless,, two periods of bitter conflict may be distinguished: *a*) at the beginning, and especially the end, of the fourth century; *A*) the middle of the sixth century.

i. At the beginning of the fourth century, Origen was already attacked by Saint Methodius of Olympus and Saint Eustathius of Antioch, but he found a clever protagonist in Pamphilus, head of the new school of Caesarea, who, in collaboration with Eusebius, composed an *Apologia pro Origene*, of which the preface, written in a very moderate tone, was a very powerful plea for the great Alexandrian.

At the end of the fourth century, the resistance to Origenism was centred in three men, although each wal

¹ L'. Prat., *op. cit.*, xlv, xlvii.

* */bili.*, XLV.

³ F. Prat., *op. cit.*, p. x.

moved by a different motive. These were *Saint Epiphanius*, *Int'érôme*, and *Theophilus of Alexandria*. The first had always been an ardent and convinced adversary to Origen : for nearly thirty years (374-403) he never ceased to combat his writings, condemning his Trinitarian errors, his misuse of allegory and the whole body of his teaching concerning the successive trials. It is probable that he was led to take up this attitude by the exaggerations of the Origenist monks of Palestine, his native country.

Theophilus of Antioch was at first a declared Origenist, and the fact that he later became a fearsome anti-Origenist must also be laid to the charge of monks; but this conversion was due more to the cudgels of the Anthropomorphites of Secta than to theological argument. The bishop employed his zeal against the monks of Nitria, who were Origenists, and expelled them from their mountains. Saint John Chrysostomus, who sheltered some of these exiles, was also destined to become a victim of this regrettable incident.

Saint Jerome had for a long time been an enthusiastic admirer of Origen, when, after 394 and especially 400, he suddenly made a violent attack upon him; although in number of personal reasons were in question, it was chiefly based on theological grounds. The outcome of his controversy with Rufinus (related elsewhere) was the condemnation of Origen's doctrines by Pope Anastasius in 400. Unfortunately, we do not know the exact content of this document or the precise nature of the errors that were condemned.

The Origenist controversy was re-opened in the sixth Century', under the Emperor Justinian. By this time, Origenism had taken on *two different forms*, a) The first is condemned at Constantinople in 543 by ten anathemas, b) at a local synod, approved by the bishops assembled in Rome in 553, and by Pope Vigilius himself. This condemned doctrine represented the teaching of the Origenist monks of Palestine and of the daily that of *Theodore Askidas* (Archbishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia) and Domitian (Bishop of Ancyra). No illusions are made to the subordination of the Divine Persons to allegorism; "some of the vague dreams so pleasing to Origen's lively imagination" are to be found "solidified into

¹ 1) E. Kämp, *Die originistischen Streitigkeiten im sechsten* Münster, 1899.

² 1) xl in Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, n. 203-211.

dogma " ", but they are aggravated by bizarre and even blasphemous opinions which were never formulated by Origen (for instance, the spherical form of the bodies of the elect; Christ to be again crucified, in the world to come, for the salvation of devils), *b*) In spite of the silence of the Acts, the Origenism which appears to have been dealt with by the fifth general council of 553 at Constantinople seems to have been still more extravagant. It was probably the work of the monks of the New Laura in Palestine, where a Syrian monk, Stephen Bar-Sudai'li, had instilled a kind of *Pantheism* into Origen's teaching. His followers were called *Isochrstes*, because their fundamental dogma taught that all men who are destined finally to lose themselves in God, as Christ had done, are also meant to become the equals of Christ. It is certain that Origen would not have recognised his own teaching in these exaggerated theories of his remote disciples.

CHAPTER IV.

Saint Hippolytus.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: *P. G.*, 10 (and 16 for the *Philosophumena*) : verJ defective; needs correcting and completing by reference to the special editions: *Corp. Berlin.*, Leipzig, 1897, for the exegetical works; *Text, u. Unters.*, Leipzig, 1905, for the Chronicles; *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1916, for the Apostolic Tradition. The *Philosophumena* have been edited by P. Wendland in the *Corp. Bert.*, IV, Leipzig, 1916.

2. Studies: E. Amann, *Hippolyte*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 2487-2511. A. d'Alès, *La théologie de saint Hippolyte*, Paris, 1906; *IdEdit dt Calliste*, Paris, 1914. DOM H. Connolly, *The so-called Egyptian Church Order and derived documents*, in *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1916. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, chiefly p. 360-369, and 392-398. I

I. LIFE OF SAINT HIPPOLYTUS. HIS WORKS.

A) Sources of information regarding his life. Very little was known of the life of Saint Hippolytus until the

1 F. Prat, *op. cit.*, p. t.tv.

• The fifteen anathemas against Origenism formulated at Constantinople in 553 are less important than those of 543 and have been omitted from the later editions of Denzinger, *Enchiridion*.

In the history of the critical studies of the nineteenth century. In this connection there exist two important documents: the first is a list of his works, inscribed on a marble statue »/ *Hippolytus in a sitting position* ', dating from the third century and rediscovered in the sixteenth century in the "cinerary of Hippolytus" on the via Tiburtina. The value of this was not fully realised until after the discovery of another important source of information, the *Philosophumaz*, at Mount Athos in 1842. This writing was first published in 1851, under Origen's name, and subsequently attributed to Tertullian, Caius of Rome and Novatian. Hüllinger finally attributed it to Hippolytus, and won over most of the critics to his opinion. It may now be said that this attribution is "as certain as any fact can be in the absence of direct evidence". This discovery has been the means of throwing a great deal of light on the career of Hippolytus, who in his day occupied no small place.

Hippolytus was born about 170-175. His birth-place is unknown. In 212, Origen, while making a pilgrimage to Rome, was present at a sermon preached by him. At this period he was a priest of Rome and a greatly esteemed scholar. He died a martyr under Maximinus the Thracian about the year 235. According to Father d'Alès, his life may be conveniently divided into three phases: a first phase devoted to scriptural work; a middle phase spent in defending the faith; and the last phase during which he was wholly occupied by personal controversies.

B) Exegetical and controversial works.

In the Scriptural writings of Hippolytus are the best part of his work. Before Origen, he was above all an exegetist. He was not such a profound scholar as the Alexandrian, but he shared with him his taste for biblical exegesis, which, however, he used more soberly and reasonably. The chief idea of his work may be gained from the three following passages: «) *Treatise on the Anti-Christ*, probably written in 202 and still extant. Composed during the persecution, it deals with the various circumstances accompanying the coming, the triumph, and the fall of Anti-Christ. It is the most complete of all the early treatises on this subject; «) *Commentary on Daniel* (about 202) is still preserved and is believed to be the earliest known commentary on Holy Scripture. «) *Commence-*

¹ d'Alès, *Thlot. Hipp.*, p. 11 et sq. E. Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 2489.

• *W.*, xxiv-xxxv.

• *Ibid.*, XI.III.

¹ E. Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 2497.

• *Ibid.*, col. 2499.

tary on the *Canticle*; the greater part is extant. In this work, 'ay Father d'Alès, "the author makes use of allegorical exegesis with the skill of an Oriental genius". Only a few useless fragments of the other commentaries and homilies are now extant. These were the commentaries on Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Zacharias, and homilies on various passages of the sacred text (Genesis, Numbers, Deuter., 1 Kings, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel). Hippolytus was a great lover of allegory but, as Photius remarks, with much greater caution than the Alesaians; he paid more attention to the grammatical and historical sense he did not, however, practise that species of exegesis which deals with word with the sacred text'.

2. His great enthusiasm for the defence of the faith led Sum Hippolytus to write a number of important works against all the forms of error then known. He thus attacked: 1) the Pagans in his Apology (lost) *Against the Greeks and against Plato*; 2) the Jews, probably in a *Demonstration against the Jews*; 3) the Gnostics, chiefly in the treatise *Against Marcion*, which should probably be identified with the book *Concerning Good and Whence comes Evil*; 4) the Montanists in the book *Concerning Charismata* (if this work is really distinct from the *Apostolical Tradition*, treated below); 5) the rabid Anti-Monarchians, such as the priest Caius, who denied the authenticity of the Joannine writings, in his *For the Gospel of Saint John and the Apocalypse* (mentioned on the statue) and in his *Capita adversus Caini* (which were known by Ebed Jesus, and are probably anterior to the preceding writing); 6) it may be that he is also responsible for the *dawa of Maratori* in which a certain aggressiveness against the Alogi may be remarked and which is attributed to Hippolytus by many critics; 7) lastly, the Modalists and the Adoptianists; the first were refuted in the *Contra Noctum* and the second in the *Contra Artemona*. It is probable that these two writings originally formed part of a larger composition directed against one or the other of these heresies, and which according to Harnack (against Bardenhewer) was the *Syntagma* or *Against all Heresies*. In this latter (now lost, but reconstituted in part by means of quotations) our author reveals every aspect of heresy according to Photius he refuted no less than 32 heresies.

C). Personal controversies. In the course of his controversy with Monarchian Modalism, Hippolytus went too far and fell into schism. Under Pope Zephyrinus (198-211) no hindrance was put in the way of Modalist propaganda in Rome. Not only did Noetus teach this error at Smyrna but even in Rome one of his disciples, *Cleomenes*, a cerinthian *Epigonos* and above all *Sabellius*, preached it openly while the Pope gave no sign; to such an extent that

1 A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

2 E. Amann, *ibid.*, col. 2498.

3 See M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon St. Jean*, Paris, 1925, introduction p. LV-LXI.

4 Lagrange, *ibid.*, p. lxi-lxv. See the *Rev. Bibl.*, 1926, p. 83-88.

"n<> one spoke of anything but monarchy," cried Terullian

Hippolytus immediately attacked the heretics, but also only reproached Zephyrinus, whom he accused of secretly undermining the heresy. The Pope, a simple and upright man, little used to theological subtleties, contented himself with stating the formulas of traditional faith at the risk of seeing himself treated as an ignoramus. He was as little concerned

with the new doctrines of the heretics as with the theories of Hippolytus, which he rightly regarded with suspicion.²

But in attacking the Pope, Hippolytus was really aiming at his secretary, Callistus, whom he accused of heresy and whom, at a later date, he slandered most unworthily. Although it is probable that in the beginning he was really motivated by zeal for the faith, it would seem that when Callistus was chosen by the Roman clergy to succeed Zephyrinus in 218, frustrated personal ambition was the cause

of his open revolt. He withdrew from the Roman community and set up a separate community which appears to have been composed of a fair number of faithful. His attitude was not weakened, even after the excommunication of Sabellius by Callistus. "He unceasingly attacked with the utmost mustice even the most reasonable acts of his rival; his incour pervades the *Philosophumena*, and the part which treats of Callistus is an absolute libel³,"

This work was posterior to 222, the year in which Callistus died, and was probably composed during the last years of Hippolytus. Photius calls it the *Labyrinth*, but its real title

Refutation of all Heresies (Κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἐλεγχὸς <).

It had been the ambitious plan of the author to expose, in the first place, the theories of the old Pagan philosophers (this is the matter of the first four books), and then to treat of the heretical systems in order to show that the heretics do

more than carry on the work of the philosophers (books 5 to 9). The 10th book is a kind of summing-up. The first part of the work is somewhat feeble; but the second is better and reveals Hippolytus as a disciple of Irenaeus. The 9th book, which deals with *Modalism*, is almost entirely

* See above, p. 174.

¹ Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 2491-2493.

² Amann, *ibid.*, 2492.

³ Adalès, *op. cit.*, p. xxiv-xxxv; 78 et sq.

ruined by prejudice: the author gives an account of his quarrels with Zephyrinus and Callistus. He accuses the latter of trickery and Monarchianism. It should be noted that Tertullian, in spite of the hate he bore to Callistus, never levelled either of these two accusations against him. The testimony of the author of *Philosophumena* is isolated and based on personal enmity. As a witness to the character and actions of Callistus, it has but the slightest, and even no authority.

D), Various other works'. The literary output of Hippolytus was voluminous and we are far from having mentioned all his work. Apart from his exegetical writings and his apologetical and controversial homilies, we know, at least by name, a number of others of a *dogmatic, historical, canonical and poetical* nature. The latter are only known from words inscribed on the statue, *Odes on all the Scriptures*.

1. Purely dogmatical works:

a) Treatise *On God and the Resurrection of the Body*, which, to judge by the remaining fragments, is the same as the *Discourse*, or rather *Letter*, addressed to the Empress *Mammaea* in answer to her question on the Resurrection.

b) *An Exhortation to Severina* (lost).

i) A writing (lost) on the *Economy*, that is to say, on the *Incarnation* mentioned by Ebed-Jesus.

2. In the historical class, the most noteworthy are the *Chronia* (χρονικά), of which a few recently discovered Greek fragments are extant, and a number of re-written Latin passages. This work is a historical and geographical compilation for the purpose of harmonising Biblical facts with profane history. A great part of it is derived from Julius Africanus.

3. His famous *Easter cycle* (Ἀπόδειξι χρόνων τοῦ πάσχα) may be included in his canonical works. This computation is mentioned in the list of his works and engraved by their side on the statue. Although Hippolytus and his admirers were extremely proud of this cycle, it failed to take the place of the Greek tables (which are ridiculed in the *Philosophumena*), and after an attempt at correction it had to be entirely abandoned.

It is possible that Hippolytus composed a disciplinary work, of which the two writings on the *necessity of fasting*; *Saturdays* and of *daily communion*, mentioned by Saint Jerome in one of his letters (*Ep.* 71, n. 7) formed a part. But the jewel of his work on Church Laws is indubitably the *Apostolical Tradition* (Ἀποστολική παράδοσις) which is inscribed on the statue and which has recently been recognised as authentic.

This work was already known and from 1891 had been given the title *Egyptian Church Ordinance*¹, since it was extant only in Coptic, Ethiopian and Arabic translations. In the old disciplinary compilations these canons were joined with other similar works having a close connection with them. The source of these documents and their mutual relations provided a never ending subject of conjecture for the critics, who showed in numerous ways how they were reciprocally dependent one on the other. It would seem that the question has been definitely solved in 1916 by an English Benedictine, Horn H. Connolly², who proved: 1) that all the disciplinary works similar to the Ordinance are posterior to it and derived from it; 2) that this Ordinance is no other than the *Apostolical Tradition* of Hippolytus³. In this manner the literary work of the Roman priest, Hippolytus, is gradually being pieced together, although it is still far from being complete*.

This attribution has both a literary and doctrinal importance. a) From a *literary* point of view, the *origin* of several disciplinary writings which derive from the Ordinance has now been ascertained in a considerable measure. This is [especially true of two which bear the name of Hippolytus, but which in their actual state cannot be directly attributed to him: the *Canones Hippolyti* and the *Constitutiones per Hippolyturns*, ff) From a *doctrinal* aspect, the *Apostolical Tradition* is of the greatest value. This little book contains the "earliest known ritual of ordinations⁶," and is a Roman ritual. It begins with the ordinations of bishops, priests and deacons, and gives long liturgical quotations. It goes on to speak of confessors, widows, readers, virgins, sub-deacons, catechumens, the times of offices and prayer, baptism, fasting, the agape, firstfruits, the Easter fast, the Paschalist and the time of prayer?. It is not known at what period of his life the author composed this book.

¹ *ägyptische Kirchenordnung*—this is the title given to it by the German [III. II. Achelis, in his study on the early sources of Oriental Canon Law, *h. resten Quellen des or. Kirchenrechts* t. I, Leipzig, 1891.

² *Ike so-called Egyptian Church Order and derived documents*, *op. cit.*, p. II-

U" in Connolly's thesis was well received by the critics. See especially L. i. Alits, in the *Rech. Sc. Rel.*, 1918, p. 132-138.

³ I. Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 2502-2505.

K l...below, p. 371.

⁶ I. HIXERONT, *L'Ordre et les Ordinations*, Paris, 1925, p. 108 sq.

r. ■ I. Nau, *Canons des Apôtres*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 1615.

[N° 662. — 8

Hippolytus continued to play his part as Anti-Pope even under the successors of Callistus (d. 222). He went on writing. His *Easter cycle* begins in 222. He was deported to Sardinia, together with the Pope, Saint Pontianus, by Maximinus the Thracian in 235. There, he was reconciled to the Church of Rome, and urged his followers to follow his example. Both Pontianus and he, died from the privation, endured in exile. He was regarded as a true martyr and buried on the Via Tiburtina in the catacomb which bears his name. It was here that the statue which bears the list of his works was erected by his admirers (discovered in 1550-

II. THE DOCTRINE OF HIPPOLYTUS. EDICT OF CALLISTUS,

Only his Trinitarian and penitential teaching will be dealt with here.

A). Trinitarian Doctrine*. While in conflict with Monarchianism, Hippolytus was led to accentuate the *distinction of the Persons*; but in so doing he allowed the unity of God to suffer. Zephyrinus reproached him with admitting two Gods (ἀπεχάλει ἡμᾶ ἰηθεον) 2, and not without some grounds. Similarly, Callistus had forcefully to maintain the *Trinity* of Persons against Sabellius and the *unity* of nature against Hippolytus. The latter, of course, accused Callistus of Sabellianism, and there is no doubt that Modalist teaching is attributed to him in the *Philosophumena*, but rightly it proves that it was really the teaching of Callistus.

The Trinitarian theology of Hippolytus is based on the doctrine of the Logos. He developed the teaching of the Apologists³, and like them, connected the generation of the Word with His creative work. Like Saint Justin, also, more energetically, he explains the *generation of the Word absolutely free*; the Father expresses His Word when He wills and as He wills. The *Philosophumena* even has this exaggerated phrase: "Man is neither God nor angel; no mistake. If (God) had desired to make thee a God, He could have done so; see the example of the Word; having desired to make thee man, He has thus made thee" *.

* A. n'Ai.ks, *La Thiol. Hipp.*, p. 8 et sq. See E. Amann, *op. cit.*, col. 2509. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 392-394.

³ *Philosophumena*, IX, n.

³ See above, p. 109.

• *Philosophumena*, X, 33.

Moreover, he accentuates the distinction of the diverse states of the Word, formulated by Saint Theophilus of Antioch, and in the *Philosophumena*. he even recognises *three distinct phases* in the "evolution of the Word : 1) the λόγος Ἀδιάθετος, that is to say, the state of the Word as an *immanent idea* of the Father, distinct from Him in a greater measure than any simple attribute; 2) the λόγος προφορικὸς, the *uttered* or engendered Word, not from nothingness, such as created beings, but from the substance of the Father; His birth is shown in the creation of the world, since He bears within Himself the archetype of the world; He is the illuminating Word, the voice of the Father and His first-born Son; 3) the υἱὸς τέλειος, the *perfect Son*, by His birth of a virgin, and His Incarnation. By thus completing the work of the Apologists, Hippolytus associated not only the creation but also the Incarnation with the generation of the Word.

These theories were fraught with great danger, threatening at the same time the eternity of the Word, the divine immutability and the equality of the Persons. No wonder Callistus was suspicious. There is no question of the faith of Hippolytus; nevertheless, his speculations on the faith were extremely perilous.

B). Penitential doctrine. In a famous passage of his *Philosophumena* Hippolytus, in a pamphleteering style, reproaches Callistus with four very serious *disciplinary innovations*: 1) excessive leniency in the forgiveness of sins; 2) the reconciliation of clerks guilty of grave sins; 3) relaxation in the matter of the continence of clerks; 4) approval of clandestine marriages between matrons and men of the baser sort. It may safely be said, *a priori*, that these reproaches are exaggerated, since in the years that followed Callistus never held in respect and his successors were never obliged to disavow his actions. The fourth is a testimony to the excellent common-sense of Callistus; this decision by no means implies his approval of incontinent actions or murder (libortion) which may have resulted accidentally and which Callistus was even led to absolve. The second and third points should be reduced to a certain leniency in a few particular cases. D'Alès declares that the general law was mainly maintained. The first reproach is more serious

• and *Syntagma* (end) : homily against Noetus.

• *philosophumena** IX, 12.

since it is of a disciplinary and sacramental nature, and raise a problem which has been discussed at length and has not yet been solved. It must be clearly set out here.

The disputed passage begins in these terms: "Callistus was the first to decide to authorise wantonness, saying that he would forgive everyone his sins. Did this leniency degenerate into weakness? We do not know, and in any case the affirmations of Hippolytus, who was his enemy, and a puritan (as we have just seen), are not enough to prove it. Nevertheless, these affirmations contain one precise detail: Callistus is accused of *innovation* by absolving *fornication* (τὰ ἡδονὰ). At the same period, Tertullian, who was at that time a Montanist, wrote in his *De Pudicitia* *Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex, scilicet Maximus, quod est episcopus episcoporum, edicit: Ego et mæchiæ et fornicationis delicta pænitentium functis dimitto. O edictum, cui adscribi non poterit bonum factum.* For a long time this edict was attributed to Pope Zephyrinus. The discovery of the *Philosophumena* caused this opinion to be modified. The similarity of circumstance in the two passages, together with the proximity of the dates, suggests that the same person is in question. All the critics are now agreed in giving the title of *Edict of Callistus* to the measure mentioned by Hippolytus and Tertullian in favour of leniency as regards the sin of fornication and adultery.

They are far from reaching agreement, however, regarding the *importance of this edict and the place it should be given in the evolution of penitential discipline*; and that is the heart of the problem. Throughout the whole of *De Pudicitia*, Tertullian affirms that three sins cannot be remitted: murder, idolatry and impurity. Origen, in his turn, in a controverted passage of *De Oratione*, declares: "I fail to understand how some are able to boast of the power of remitting the sins of idolatry, adultery and fornication..." In the seventeenth century, these two texts gave rise to a theory (Petau, Sirmond) which has become classical. It may be summed up as follows: for two centuries the Church refused to pardon the sins of *idolatry, murder and adultery*. Callistus was the first to extend forgiveness to sins of the flesh (*Edict of Callistus*). Pope Cornelius (252-253) was the first to reconcile apostates. Later, at an unknown date, murder became matter for the Sacrament of Penance and was absolved. This is the current opinion. Nevertheless, several theologians have always opposed this attractive hypothesis, with the affirmation that the *Edict of Callistus* did not possess the *revolutionary* character that is ascribed to it, since the three sins in question were still regarded as unpardonable by primitive penitential discipline. The discussion of this question will be reserved for the following chapter on Tertullian.

Here, we can examine the elements which are supplied by Hippolytus for the solution of the problem. He relates

¹ *De Pudicitia* I, 6.

² See A. d'Alès, *DEdit de Calliste*. See also J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 360-369.

³ See above, p. 215. — ⁴ See above, p. 88-89.

t" three sins, for he says: Sin, the bloodsucker, has three daughters: Impudicity, Murder, Idolatry, and they have not been able to sate her!...; but this commentary contains no allusion to any special reservation. Neither does the *Philosophumena* speak of one; on the contrary, the teaching and conduct of Callistus seem to imply the denial of any such reservation; he affirms his right to absolve, and actually pardons impudicity, if not murder. With Rossi and d'Alès it may be surmised "that during the pontificate of Callistus a certain softening down of discipline in particular cases took place; and that his enemies probably resented his extremely discreet innovations in disciplinary matters much less than they did his energy in dogmatically affirming the Church's unrestricted right of granting pardon." And Funk himself, in 1907, approved the conclusion arrived at by Father d'Alès in his "Théologie d'Hippolyte" (p. 48) in the following terms: "In a lesser degree even than Tertullian, can Hippolytus be quoted to prove that the Roman Church, prior to Callistus, held that the three sins of impudicity, murder and idolatry were absolutely unpardonable, both in theory and in practice *."

CHAPTER V.

Tertullian.

SPECIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY.

i Editions: *P. L.*, 1-3 (reproduction of Rigault's edition, Paris, A better edition is Fr. Oehler, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani quæ W sunt omnia*, Leipzig, 1853-1854. The *Corpus of Vienna*, t. 20 (1890) lii. l 17 (1906), has published as yet only half of Tertullian's works.

l i Studies: A. d'Alès, *La théologie de Tertullien*, Paris, 1905; *L'I-dit de Calliste*, Paris, 1914 (p. 136-216). P. de Labriolle, *La crise miste*, Paris, 1913; *Hist. lit. lat. chrét.*, p. 72-144. P. Monceaux, *lit. Ajr. chrét.*, I, Paris, 1901. Mgr. Freppel, *Tertullien*, 2 vol. l'un, 1861, 1862. E. de Backer, *Sacramentum, le mot et l'idée y/, tentée par lui dans les œuvres de Tertullien*, Louvain, 1911.

* ('mini. In *Proverb.*, (frag.), η. 57.

A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 217-227.

M. PERROUD, *La prescription théologique d'après Tertullien*, Montpellier, 1914. Funk, *Tertullien et l'Agape*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, t. IV, V, Vil. P. GUILLOUX, *Dévolution religieuse de Tertullien*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, t. XIX. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 317-353. *Etudes*, 1st series, chiefly p. 69-110; 2nd series, *L'Eucharistie*, p. 204-226. J. Tixeront, *Tertullien moraliste*, in *Mélanges*, p. 117-152; *///>/. Dogm.*, 1, 1st edit., p. 329-352; 9th edit., 332 et sq. See also the introduction to de Labriolle's special editions, in *Textes et documents*, for three treatises, 1906-1907, and introduction to J. P. Waltzing's *L'Apologeticum*, Louvain, 1910.

I. TERTULLIAN'S LIFE AND CHARACTER.

A). Nothing is known of the origins of the African Latin Church; it is possible that it received the faith from Rome, but this has never been proved. The first historical document which mentions it (*The Acts of the Martyrs of Scillium*, about 178) contains no reference to its organisation, but Tertullian in his letter to Scapula and in his *Apologeticum* supposed that the greater part of the population will already be Christian in his time. In the third century the Latin Church drew most of its writers from Africa. During this period also African writers occupied a considerable place in contemporary literary spheres. *Tertullian* (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus), the first great representative of this splendid line of writers, was born at Carthage between 150-160 of Pagan parents. His father was a centurion in the pro-consular army. Although his youth, as he himself confessed, was somewhat given to pleasure, it was not wasted. He studied literature, philosophy, medicine and especially law. It is possible that he practised as a lawyer or advocate. In any case his temperament was well suited to such a profession. Moreover, Mgr. Duchesne is of opinion that there is no impossibility in thinking that he may have been a lawyer Tertullian, of whose works some fragments are preserved in the Digest.

Tertullian's conversion dates from about 195. We are ignorant of the motives which led him to take this step unless we surmise that an allusion is made to them in his writings, when he speaks of the great impression he received from the sight of the martyrs' heroism and the power of Christian exorcism. Soon after his conversion he undertook the defence of Christianity, and from this period dates the majority of his Apologies. Although he was married, it ■

it is presently held that he was ordained priest about the year 200*.

The great turning point in Tertullian's Christian life was his adhesion to Montanism. For some ten years after his conversion his orthodoxy was above reproach, and he gave himself unstintingly in the defence of the Church and apostolical labours. But about 206 his intemperate zeal and mysticism caused him to join the sect of Montanus, whose rigorous teaching he found excellently adapted to his own temperament. Nevertheless, it was only after 213 that he definitely broke with the Church. From this date he used till his splendid talents in combating the *psychicists*, that is to say, ordinary Catholics, who were regarded by the heretics as carnal and gross, since they neglected the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Tertullian found himself unable to remain permanently a member of this heresy, which had but few adherents in Carthage. He founded a party of his own. It was known by his name and even possessed one of the basilicas of Carthage. Saint Augustine tells us that it was he who brought the last remaining Tertullianists back to the Church. Tertullian's Christian life should be divided into 3 periods, necessary for the better understanding of his writings:

I. Catholic period (from 195-206).

II. Semi-Montanist period (from 206-212).

III. Montanist period (from 213).

The last period is marked by a considerable slowing down of his literary output. Whilst he wrote 20 works during the first period and 13 in the second, he only produced 6 from 213 to 222. He spent his last years in complete retirement, and the date of his death is unknown. According to Saint Jerome, he lived to extreme old age and died about 240-250. There is nothing to show that he was ever reconciled to the Church.

The abstract of his works will add the necessary materials to this biographical summary. A few remarks on the part of himself will not be out of place here.

The predominating trait in his character was his *will*. He allowed no obstacle to stand in his way, but his

I, recent critics such as Monceaux, Harnack, H. Koch, Bardenhewer (*Introduktion*) held that Tertullian was not a priest. Other critics, however, consider reasons insufficient in the face of Saint Jerome's testimony: *Tertullianus, idyltor...* (*De Viris*, 53). — *De haeresibus*, I.XXXVI. P. L. 42, 46-47.
 I... the outline of Tertullian's life in the above mentioned study of G. L. LOUX, *Madation religieuse de Tertullien*, *op. cit.*, p. 5-24, 141-156.

determination rapidly took on a hard and bitter character. He had the fighter's temperament; thus it is that near!)'. In his works are *controversial*, and in them he displays all his marvellous powers of argument; closely-linked dialectic, sarcasm and irony. All his life he fought for truth, good and right, or at least what he thought was such. But his somewhat intemperate energy was really based on pride, which is revealed by his *impatience* and feverish haste to finish off an adversary. Of the qualities necessary to an administrator he had only energy; he lacked that *suppleness* which goes round, rather than through, the obstacle, and that *pondération* which recognises the part which the passage of time, and divine and human influences play in the lives of men.

Tertullian was given to excess in everything, even in his reasoning. His was a brilliant and vigorous mind, endowed with rare powers of penetration and a wide culture, but at the same time he was a ruthless logician and did not flinch from paradox. This turn of mind rendered him particularly unfitted for the role of *moralist*, which he assumed far too often. Owing to his *defective sense of proportion* he was not always able to understand first principles and apply them without exaggeration. His lack of flexibility also made of him much of a stickler for principle, so that he was unable to adapt them to the infinite variety of particular circumstances.

His great qualities as a writer are well known. No doubt he had a number of shortcomings; sometimes he was affected and played to the gallery; elsewhere he is too concise to be clear. But "he gave great care to his *composition*; his writings are all well planned, and even in his widest digressions he never loses sight of his goal. His *style* is quite original; it is precise, colourful and varied. His phrase never lags, but moves on irresistibly, taking the reader, whom it leaves no time to breathe, in its stride. Even his *neologisms* have their *raison d'être*... He is the real founder of Latin theological terminology" 2.

Saint Cyprian⁸ used to read Tertullian daily, but posterity gradually began to forget the great African. With the Renaissance he came into favour again.

1 J. Tixeront, *Tertullien moraliste*, in the *Mélanges*, p. 147-150.

SJ. Tixeront, *Patrologie*, p. 143.

⁸ Saint Cyprian caused Tertullian's works to be brought to him every day, saying: *Da Magistrum* (St. Jerome, *De Vir. ill.*, 55).

II. WORKS OF TERTULLIAN.

Chronological list of extant works

I. Catholic period.

l	Ad Martyres	197 (Feb.-March)	Moral
j	Ad nationes	» (after Feb.)	Apolo.
l	<i>Apologeticum</i>	» end of the year	Ap.
	De testimonio animæ	197-200	Ap.
l	De spectaculis	200 circa	Mor.
6	<i>De præscriptione hæreticorum</i>	»	Controv.
■	De oratione	200-206	Mor.
K	De patientia	>	Mor.
<l	De baptismo	»	Sacraml ^s
)i>	<i>Depoenitentia</i>	»	Sacr ^o
j1	De cultu feminarum	>	Mor.
j	Ad uxorem	>	Sacr ^o
l ;	Adv. Hermogenum	>	Controv.
14	Adv. Judæos	>	Ap.

II. Semi-Montanist period.

l,	De virginibus velandis	206 circa	Mor.
B	Adv. Marcionem	207-208 for bk. I-iv.	
»	De pallio	208-211 for bk. v.	Contr.
ill	Adv. Valentinianos	209	Moral (?)
p.	De Carne Christi	208-211	Contr.
ln	De resurrectione carnis	>	Contr.
n.	De anima	>	Contr.
«	De exhortatione castitatis	>	Sacr ^o
ll	De corona	211	Mor.
14	De idololatria	211-212	Mor.
li	Scorpiace	>	Ap.
lh	<i>Id Scapulam</i>	212 (end)	Ap.

III. Montanist period.

W.	De fuga in persecutione	213	Mor.
N.	Adv. <i>Praxeam</i>	after 213	Contr.
h	De monogamia	»	Sacr ^o
n	De jejuniis	>	Mor.
■	<i>De Pudicitia</i> ¹ .	217-222	Sacr ^o

¹ This table is a slightly modified reproduction of that of O'Alti's, *La Thiol, de yuulhen*, p. XIII.

² In the list of seven lost works of Tertullian are known: 1. *Liber ad amicum Ulpianum* (before 197); 2. *De censu anima* (200-206); 3. *Adv. Apelleiaeos* (ta> .16); 4. *De fato* (200-206); 5. *De paradiso* (200-206); 6. *De spe fidilium* (tai j ki); 7. *De ecstasi libri VII* (after 213).

Tertullian's writings deal with four principal subjects:

1. The Defence of Christianity {*apologetical writings*} 5 treatises).
2. The Conflict with Heresy {*controversial writings*} 8 treatises).
3. Morality and Christian virtues (12 treatises).
4. Sacramental discipline (6 treatises).

The abstract will follow the order of this classification

A). Apologetical writings. Five works: *Ad nationes*, 2nd (cf. above table); *Apologeticum*, 3rd; *De testimonio animæ*, 4th; *Adv. Judæos*, 14th; *Ad Scapulam*, 26th.

1. The *Ad nationes* (197), in two books, denounces the crimes of the Pagans (bk. 1), and criticises their polytheistical doctrines, which are exposed according to Varro (bk. 11). The entire work is a violent application to the Pagans of the scriptural text: "Cast out first the beam out of thine own eye, and then shalt thou see to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye". This work is more of an outline than a finished composition. The text is mutilated and incomplete.

2. The *Apologeticum* (197), on the contrary, is a masterpiece of controversial writing. The author employs the highest form of eloquence, inspired by his vigorous dialectic method and his pride at being a Christian. He harries his adversaries with biting sarcasm. Although he does not abandon the traditional apologetical method which might appeal to reason, common-sense and human nature, he has used the very arguments which the Pagans levelled at the Christians, Tertullian prefers to address the magistrature, the Emperor, and to speak in the name of the law. This work, which contains 50 chapters, is really the special pleading of a professional lawyer, aimed at proving to the provincial governors, especially those of Africa that the exceptional measures taken against the Christians are both unjust and unlawful.

This thesis is contained in the *first chapters* (1-6) and is proved by the absence of regular proceedings (1), by the unreasonableness of the Edict of Trajan (2), by unjust accusations, based on ignorance of the

1 The reader is referred to Migne's edition which is the most usual. An abstract of all these works may be found in A. d'Alès, *Théol. de Tert.*, I, 1 P. L., I, 559-608.

2 P. L., I, 257-536.

* For a long time the critics were misled by Eusebius into thinking it addressed to the Roman Senate.

posed crimes (3), *d*) by the violation of natural and positive law in the laws framed against the Christians (4-6).

After this energetic introduction, Tertullian turns to the refutation of III. *usual accusations* made against the Christians (7-45): *a*) first, the *secret infamies* (*occulta facinora*), child murder and incest (7-9); *public* ... *political crimes* (*facinora manifestiora*), impiety in particular (10-28); note in ch. 17 the affirmation that every upright man instinctively knows the God of the Christians: *O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christiana*; *c*) crimes of high treason, and plots against the State (19-45); note, in ch. 37, the famous description of Christian power: *hesterni sumus et vestri omnia implevimus: urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabulo, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, /mum; sola vobis reliquimus templa*.

Conclusion, (46-50): our teaching is true, our conduct is irreproachable, and you massacre us in vain. The last chapter resembles a triumphal cry and a last defiance of the persecutors: *semen est sanguis Christianorum!*

When compared with this eloquent and impassioned work, the *D(testimonio animæ* ' seems feeble. It consists of a short treatise in 11 chapters, for the purpose of developing the seventeenth chapter of the Apologeticum. It has been variously appreciated by the critics; it would appear to be no more than an appendix to the above work. Moreover, it contains no more than an attempt at a psychological demonstration of Christian truth.

p The *Ad Scapulam* (212)' is a letter divided into 15 chapters, addressed to Scapula, Governor of Africa and a persecutor of the Christians. It threatens him with divine punishment in the next world and returns in this. Tertullian thus anticipates Lactantius, in showing how the will of God will avenge His children. The writing is brought to an end by an earnest appeal not to fight with God (Θεομαχέειν).

I 5. Tertullian also undertook to defend Christianity Against the Jews, the instigators of all the persecutions against the Christians: *omnigogus fudaorum fontes persecutionum*, as he says elsewhere (Siviv/, X). Nevertheless the fourteen chapters of the *Adv. fudaos* (206) were entirely given to proving the decay of the Mosaic Law and the coming of Christ as announced by the prophets. It has been suggested that the last six chapters were interpolated here, from the *Adv. barbarionem*, by a later copyist; but this is far from being proved.

I B). *Controversial works*. Eight writings: *De Præscriptiione*, 6th; *Adv. Hermogenem*, 13th; *Adv. Marcionem*, 16th; *Valentinianos*, 18th; *De carne Christi*, 19th; *De resurgidione carnis*, 20th; *De anima*, 21st; *Adv. Praxeam*, 28th (cf. table, p. 233).

I i. Tertullian's doctrinal works are nearly all controversial, chiefly aimed at refuting the heretics. The oldest and the

1 L., I, 608-618.
• L., I, 697-706.
• L., 2, 597-642-

most important is the treatise *De praescriptione hærcticorum**, one of the best of the author's works, written about 200. He takes up the argument of Saint Irenaeus, regarding the interpretation of the *rule offaith* by Apostolical tradition.' He gives an impressive rigour to this argument by presenting it in a legal form.

The heretics claimed to correct the rule of faith by means of the Scriptures, but Tertullian denied them this, on the ground that they had no right to the Scriptures, which belong only to the Churches founded by the Apostles or derive from them. Only these Churches, by reason of uninterrupted possession or prescription have the right to use them. Thus, whenever the heretics make an attempt to cite the Bible in their favour, this prescription can be opposed to them as a *juridical exception*. An exception is a previous difficulty, having a just cause, which puts a stop to all legal pleading! In this connection, the exception is reduced to a defect of legal form, that is to say, the unlawful use of a means without proof. Underlying this thesis there is really nothing more than the apostolicity of the rule of faith which had already been developed by Tertullian's predecessors, in particular by Saint Irenaeus. Tertullian went out to meet the heretics with an *exceptio novitatis*. Moreover he did not stop at giving only a general justification of the *regula fidei*; he completed it both by an examination of circumstances and by the solution of objections.

The development of this argument forms the essence of the treatise, which comprises 44 chapters and which can be conveniently divided into two parts and a conclusion.

The first part warns the faithful against heresy and heretics: *a*) heresies are necessary evils and are a source of scandal only to the weak (1-3); *b*) they were foretold (4-6); *c*) they have their origin in philosophy and uncurbed curiosity (7-12); *d*) the rule of faith should be enough for true Christians (13-14).

The second part (15-37) unfolds the argument of *prescription* or tradition: *a*) heretics base their arguments on the Scriptures but they have no right to do so (15-19); *b*) the Church is the sole heir of Christ in direct succession (20-21).

* *P. L.*, 2, 12-60. See the edition of P. de Labriolle, with introduction, translation and notes, in *Textes et Documents*, Paris, 1907. Abstract I. A. d'Alès, *Théologie de Tertullien*^ p. 200-213.

the Apostles received the whole of revealed doctrine and have communicated it in its entirety (22-28); *d*) it is obvious that truth is prior to error, and that heresy came only in the second place (29-36); *e*) chapter 37 is the conclusion and the summary of this second part: *mea est possessio; olivi possideo, prior possideo, habeo origines firmas ab ipsis auctoribus quorum fuit res. Ego sum heres apostolorum.*

The general conclusion (38-44) is a confirmation of the whole work. The doctrinal inspiration of heretics is a work of the devil (38-40); their relaxed discipline manifests their errors (41-42); *doctrinæ index disciplina est* (*ibid.*, 43). They even enter into relations with astrologers, philosophers and tricksters (43-44). And having crushed his opponents, the terrible controversialist holds them up to ridicule.

2. After this general refutation of heresy, Tertullian attacked two of the more particular forms which heresy had taken on in his time; the Gnosticism of Marcion, Hermogenes and Valentinus, and the Monarchianism of Praxeas.

a). He first refuted Marcion in 200, but only the third edition of his '*Adv. Marcionem*', revised and completed by the author in 207-211, is extant. The work consists of 5 books, aimed at proving: 1. the unity of (the good and just God (bk. 1); 2. the identity of God and the Creator (bk. 2); 3. the unity of Christ (bk. 3). The last books refute Marcion's writing, the *Antitheses*, by reference to Saint Luke (bk. 4) and to Saint Paul (bk. 5). Tertullian here treats of the moral attributes of God.

b). Hermogenes was a disciple of Marcion and, like him, a dualist. He taught that matter was eternal, distinct from and independent of God. In the *Adversus Hermogenem* Tertullian shows that the world had a beginning, that God alone is eternal and the Creator of matter, and that nature, far from being evil, reveals God's perfections.

1). The treatise *Adv. Valentinianos*³ has no great value. Tertullian did not take Valentinism seriously enough and burlesqued the adventures of the aeons.

3. The Gnostics are again attacked in the *De carne Christi* and the *De resurrectione carnis*. These two treatises have much in common and form together a complete work.

The *De carne Christi* establishes, against Docetism, that the Body of Christ is real; to deny this is to deny the Redemption, and Tertullian pathetically adds: "*parce uniae spei totius orbis!*" (ch. 5). The Body of Christ is not a

¹ F. Z., 2, 239-524.

² L., 2, 197-238.

³ F. Z., 2, 538-594.

⁴ F. Z., 2, 754-792.

heavenly body, but was really born of a woman; Christ was destined to be born, as He was destined to die. To give more force to this doctrine, Tertullian went as far as denying the virginity of Mary, not of course her virginity *ante partum*, but her virginity *in partu* (He denied her virginity *post partum* for other reasons) ¹.

b) The other treatise, *De Resurrectione carnis* ², is one of Tertullian's best works. Before stating the Scriptural arguments, which are the true proofs of his thesis, Tertullian endeavours to give a number of rational demonstrations in favour of the Resurrection: the dignity that the body derives from its association with the soul; the power of God; natural analogies; and the need for the body to be judged as well as the soul.

c) The *De anima* ³ may be classed with the preceding work, since it adds the finishing touch to Tertullian's anthropology. It consists of 58 chapters and deals with the nature of the soul (ch. 1-22), its origin (23-41), death, and sleep which is the image of death (42-58). The author's faith enabled him to avoid the Platonic dreams of the migration of soul⁴. He also rejected Stoic teaching in a large measure, although he always retained a rather gross idea of the spirituality of the soul which latter he regarded as being both corporeal and yet simple. He firmly asserted man's free-will, and by so doing established his *moral teaching* on solid grounds.

4. In the *Adversus Praxeas* ¹ Tertullian attacked *Monarchianism* (after 212). The passionate animosity which he shows in this work is explained by the fact that Praxeas was an enemy of the Montanists, to which heresy Tertullian belonged at the time. Hence the hard and bitter character of the discussion and its vigorous logic. He accuses Praxeas ² of having done away with the Paraclete and of having crucified the Father. This doctrine, he says, is wrongly taught in the name of "*Monarchy*" since there is no question of unity being destroyed by the *economy* which does but "array unity as a trinity" ³. There are three *Persons*, not

¹ A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 185-198. See particularly p. 196, note 3.

² P. L., 2, 795-886.

³ P. L., 2, 646-752. Cf. also J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 1, 406-407.

⁴ P. L., 2, 154-196.

⁵ Custodiat *economia* sacramentum, quæ unitatem in trinitatem disponit (Adn. Prax., 2).

by a difference of essence (*statu*) but by degree (*gradu*); not by a difference of substance (*substantia*) but by form (*forma*); not by a difference of power (*potestate*) but by appearance (*specie*): God is one, and there is therefore but one substance, one reality, and one power; nevertheless there exists a diversity of degree, form and appearance, from whence derive the names of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Such are the principles exposed by the author at the beginning of the book (ch. 2). What follows is but the development of the foregoing.

This is a remarkable book, in spite of the few errors and terminological inexactitudes that it contains. The personality of the Holy Ghost stands out most clearly. In this respect Tertullian's Montanism was useful to him, inasmuch as it gave him a better understanding of the traditional formulas concerning the Paraclete: the Holy Ghost is God with the Father and the Son 1, the same substance as the Father 2; in short, He is God 3. As Tixeront remarks 4, until the time of Saint Athanasius, Tertullian was the only one of the fathers to affirm the divinity of the Holy Ghost in such absolute and categorical terms. He expresses the procession by the words *a Patre per Filium*, which correspond to the Greek conception of the Trinity 5.

C). Moral and disciplinary works 6. These consist of 17 treatises which can be reduced to four principal classes, according to the particular matters of which they treat. The date of composition 7 of these writings should be carefully noted, for in no other of his works has Tertullian's character been so strongly marked. His leaning towards rigorism likewise came accentuated as he grew older, and left traces in everything he touched.

i. The *Ad Martyres* § (197), *Scorpiae* (211), and *De Fuga in persecutione* (213) deal with the way Christians should behave during

¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

² *ibid.*, 3, 4.

³ *Ibid.*, 13, 20.

⁴ *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 400.

⁵ *Adv. Prax.*, 4.

⁶ For all these writings see Tixeront, *Tertullien moraliste*, in *Melanges*, 117-152.

⁷ Bracketed figure refers to chronological table.

¹ I, 619-628.

² *I. l.* 2, 121-154 (*Adversus gnósticos scorpiae*.)

³ *I. l.*, 2, 103-120.

persecution. *The first* [1] is a simple letter for the purpose of exhorting the Christians in prison to keep the peace among themselves, and to go to their deaths courageously rather than deny their faith. This writing is remarkable for its fineness of thought and feeling. Although somewhat rhetorical in tone, it is never really exaggerated.

The second [25] bears the title "Remedy against the bites of Scorpions", or, in other words, against the heretical theories which deny the need of confessing the faith even unto death. The title alone gives some idea of Tertullian's vehement defence of his thesis.

The third [27] is the first of the openly Montanist writings. With obvious exaggeration, he condemns those who take flight during persecution, and the bribing of magistrates in order to obtain peace. God, he says, desires or allows persecution. Therefore it must be accepted under pain of apostasy.

2. *The relations of the Christians with the Pagans* are dealt in the treatises *De Spectaculis* (200), *De corona* (211), *De idololatria* (211) with ever increasing severity. In the *first writing* [5] Tertullian, who was still a Catholic at that time, forbids entirely, in the name of the Scriptures, all games (in the circus, stadium and amphitheatre), degrading them to be immoral and intimately connected with idolatry. *The second* [23] was written in defence of a Christian soldier who refused to wear the laurel crown prescribed by the rules for all those who were to receive the "donativum" (a gift of money made by the Emperor). The soldier preferred to go to prison to await death. Tertullian approved this zeal, which most people considered excessive. He also insinuated that the bearing of arms is incompatible with Christianity. *The third* [24], which sets forth and gives a solution to the problem of the relation with Paganism, is still more severe. The author was right in forbidding Christians to manufacture idols and statues and to assist in Pagan worship, but he went too far when, under pretext of avoiding co-operation in evil, he denied them the right of being, not only soldiers, but also traders, government servants and school-masters. And yet he allowed children to attend the Pagan schools!

3. *Modesty in dress* is recommended by the *De cultu feminarum* [11] and in *De virginibus velandis* [15] which prescribes that the veil of the young married women be worn by all young girls, both in the streets and in church. The *De pallio* [17] treats of another subject. It is a bitter satire on those who greeted him with ironical laughter that day he decided to abandon the Roman toga in favour of the philosopher's cloak (*pallium*).

4. The *De oratione* (200-206), the *De patientia* (id.) and the *De jejuniis* (after 213) concern *Christian practices and virtues*. *TI*

¹ *P. L.*, I, 627-662.

³ *P. L.*, 2, 76-102.

³ *P. L.*, I, 663-696.

⁴ *P. L.*, I, 1304, 1334 (in two books).

⁵ *P. L.*, 2, 888-914.

⁶ *P. L.*, 2, 1029-1050.

⁷ *P. L.*, I, 1149-1196.

⁸ *P. L.*, I, 1249-1274.

⁹ *P. L.*, 2, 953-978.

I)). Works concerning sacramental discipline. Six treatises on marriage, baptism and penance.

I 3. *Christian initiation and penance* are treated in the De baptismo 4 (200-206) and the De pænitentia 5 (200-206). The De pudicitia 6 (213-222) must be classed apart. The *Mlat* 9, which was meant to combat the “heretical” venom of the flip “viper Quintilla” who denied the necessity of baptism, consists of 20 chapters and deals with both disciplinary and moral aspects of the Sacrament which makes us the

• *Γ* I., 2, 979-1030. Edited together with the preceding treatise by I. L. Iliadis, 1906.

pisciculi secundum Ἰχθὺν *nostrum*: the matter and the rites of baptism (1-6), unction and the imposition of hands (7-8), institution, necessity and unity (9-16), minister, time and place of administration (17-20). This work is very precious in connection with the beginnings of ritual, especially as regards baptism and confirmation.

It has its complement in the little treatise in 12 chapters *De Pænitentia* 12[10] written at the same period. After a number of *general considerations* on penance (1st part; 1-5), the author treats of *ante-baptismal* penitential discipline (2nd part: 6) and *post-baptismal* (3rd part: 7-12). Four passages should be particularly noticed, a) *In chapter 4*, the universality of penance is affirmed: *omnibus ergo delictis, seu carne seu spiritu, seu facto, seu voluntate commissis, qui pœnam per judicium destinavit idem et veniam per pœnitentiam spondit*, b) *In chapter 7*, post-baptismal penance, or *second penance* is always spoken of as being conferred but once, and is compared to the first purification. Baptism and penance are two similar institutions, both termed planks of salvation for man *Quid ultra de istis duabus humane salutis quasi plancis* (ch. 12). c) *Chapter 8* deals with confession 3 which is to be made to God through the intermediary of the bishop or the priest. Tertullian did not affirm this as explicitly as Saint Cyprian, but it is supposed by his doctrine: the nature and length of penance is to be determined by the bishop alone. Moreover, confession is *secret*, d) *In chapters 9 and the following*, Tertullian vividly describes the *exomologesis*, or in other words, the exterior manifestation of penance (fasting; prayer, prostrations, etc.). These trials are terminated by reconciliation with God, sponsored by the Church (ch. 10, n. 8).

According to the “*De pænitentia*” divine forgiveness is bound up with ecclesiastical reconciliation. Catholic critics are all agreed now-a-days in recognising that the latter is clearly indicated in this work, but certain authors are of the opinion that this reconciliation did not cover *all sins*, since certain sins could only be pardoned by God alone. If nothing in this treatise justifies a distinction between sins which the Church can pardon and those she cannot, nor between divine and ecclesiastical forgiveness. On the contrary; the list of sins, the similarity of baptism and penance, the

1 See A. N. Aifès, *Edit de Callisti*, p. 136-171.

2 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, 442 sq.

(clesiastical meaning of the words, *absolvere, restitutus, restitutio, etc.*, shows that it is through the Church that reconciliation with God for all sins is to be obtained

3. The *De pudicitia* [31] was composed some fifteen to twenty years after the foregoing work. It is violently Montanist in character and contains an entirely different teaching based on other principles². Tertullian abandons his theory of prescription in favour of the law of *progress: nemo profectus erubescit* (i, 11). He glories in the fact of having renounced the errors he previously held: "I am not ashamed of having freed myself from error" (*Ibid.*).

This violent requisition against the Psychicists was occasioned by the *Edict of Callistus* (1, 6: "audio etiam edictum" etc. 3). In contradiction to this Catholic teaching he proposed his thesis of *remissible and irremissible sins* (ch. 2) « Inch he presents as one of the main features of Montanism. He is careful to anticipate the objection made by the Psychicists: what manner of penance is this, that does not obtain forgiveness for sins? (ch. 3). There is no doubt that the real motive of Tertullian's defection was the fact that the Catholics taught that no sin was exempt from forgiveness, and this also gave rise to the clear distinction he formulates between human forgiveness (*pacem humanam*) and divine forgiveness (*veniam quam a solo Deo exorat*) 4.

I After having proposed his thesis he undertakes to prove it. First of all he draws up a list of irremissible sins: adultery, murder and idolatry (4-5). He then attempts to show that Huth is the true teaching of the Scriptures (6-20). He has no hesitation in contradicting his own previous interpretation of the parables of divine mercy, found in Saint Luke (xx): the lost sheep, the lost groat, the prodigal son. He finds no support for his thesis in tradition and denied all Authenticity to Hermas who seemed to contradict him.

II At the end of the treatise, Tertullian, in order to strengthen his demonstration, makes an onslaught on the very root of the doctrine he is attacking. He endeavours to give a

¹ A. u'Alès, *ibid.*, 154-168.

² A. d'Alès, *EEdit de Callisti*, p. 172-216.

• the preceding chapter, p. 228.

• *in* *Deo* cam a solo Deo exorat. *Pudicit.*, 3.

• *Arnit.*, 8.

• tiller apocrypha et falsa judicaretur, adultera et ipsa, et inde patrona sociomii *l'udicit.*, io.

dogmatical foundation to his system by means of a subversive theory of *hierarchical authority* based on an ingenious distinction between *disciplina* and *potestas*. By *disciplina* he means the ordinary power of government and teaching by *potestas* or *imperium* he signifies an extraordinary gift of the Holy Ghost, vouchsafed only to the chosen of the Paraclete. The Apostles possessed both these gifts; but the second was personal and was not given to the *hierarchy* which has only inherited the *disciplina*. The *potestas* is given to the *spiritual* alone. Now since the forgiveness of grave sins is proper to the *potestas*, it follows that the Church has the power to remit all sins, but the hierarchy has not. Hence "Tertullian regarded the *action of Callistus as unforgivable*, when the latter usurped, in the name of Catholicism this extraordinary gift of *potestas*, which is proper only to those who are especially favoured by the Holy Ghost." In the last chapter (22), Tertullian also reproaches Callistus with having given to the martyrs the power of remission which he himself had usurped. Here again, Tertullian contradicts his own previous teaching in which he had lauded this great privilege of confessors of the faith; now he reserves it only to the Montanist martyrs.

4. Conclusion. Importance of the Edict of Callistus'

It would seem that the action taken by Pope Callistus may be reduced to the following regulations, and this view of the questions, as d'Alès⁴ remarks, is "the only plausible explanation of the known facts". Canonical penance was severe, and lasted for a considerable length of time; it is very probable (though not certain) that in the case of certain sins it lasted a whole lifetime. Hippolytus regarded this as normal. Moreover, we know from other sources that a wave of rigorism passed through the Church at the beginning of the third century. Saint Cyprian, for instance, about 251 speaks of it in Africa: "A number of bishops among our predecessors", says he⁵, "thought themselves unable to pardon sins of the flesh; but they did not secede from the orthodox."

¹ A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, 196.

² *Ad Martyres*, I.

³ We have already touched on this subject in the chapters on *Hernias*, p. and *Origen*, p. 215, and *Hippolytus*, p. 226-229.

⁴ *Edict de Calliste*, p. 232.

⁵ *Ep.* LV, 21.

who did pardon such sins ". Cyprian says nothing of idolatry and murder. This African severity undoubtedly had its origins in Montanism. At Rome it derived from Hippolytus. Callistus lifted up his voice against this strict rule, and his merciful action, which must certainly have given new courage to many poor souls, did but call forth the anger of his adversaries.

Whilst *Hippolytus* and his followers talked of scandalous disciplinary reforms, Tertullian, the Montanist, was furious at the Pope's clear affirmation of his *right to absolve*. His Indignation took form in the *De pudicitia* with the doctrine of the *three irrémissible sins*. He did not reproach Callistus with the absolution of sins of the flesh, but based his argument on the fact that the *Churches* did not extend pardon to *idolatry* and *murder* ¹. He meant of course the Montanist Churches. But d'Alès observes that in the last period Tertullian's sincerity was not so irreproachable that " his testimony should oblige us to admit that such a severe discipline, which has left no trace of its existence, really existed unquestioned in the Church " ². Moreover, Tertullian singularly aggravated the nature of this discipline by going on to enumerate as many as seven or eight irrémissible sins. Even if the number of such sins were restricted to three, such a refusal of forgiveness does not correspond to the reality, as it existed in the Catholic Church. It would seem, therefore, that it is only in his too brief *De penitentia* that Tertullian reveals himself as a sincere witness to Tradition, and a true theologian of the Sacrament of Penance.

III. DOCTRINAL SYNTHESIS.

Tertullian may be considered from threefold aspect: *a)* as a theologian in general; *b)* as a Catholic theologian; *c)* as a Montanist theologian.

I A). The theologian in general, i. Tertullian is the first founder of theology in the West. Latin theology not only has its own language but also its own particular character. This it owes, no doubt, to the peculiar turn of mind of the Western peoples, who are especially interested

¹ *fflrif.*, 12.

² nZ, p. 237.

in everything of a positive and practical nature. More than any other, Tertullian was the embodiment of these tendencies, and he it was who transmitted them to the writers who came after him.

Unlike his contemporaries, the Eastern theologians, Tertullian was not a *philosopher*. He was not a stranger to philosophy, but he mistrusted it and regarded it as the source of all heresies. *Adeo quid simile philosophus et Christianus? Gneciæ discipulus et cæli?* ¹ He called philosophers the "patriarchs of the heresies" ². Nevertheless, he did not hesitate to use them when necessary: "Seneca sæpe noster" ³! But speculation, in the proper sense of the word, meant nothing to him.

2. Although Tertullian had not the philosopher's speculative mind, he had a highly developed legal sense; as a lawyer he took law into the realms of doctrine. He thus endowed theology with a number of original *theories* which still survive. He invented and perfected a new *terminology* for the better expression of new theological ideas and thereby rendered the sacred science more precise and supple than it had ever been before. Tertullian is thus the first true Western theologian, and many characteristic theories of Western theology may be traced back to him.

It was through a lawyer's eyes that Tertullian considered the Scriptures when he gave to them the name of *Instrumentum*, a document having a legal value ⁴. He made a distinction between the *instrumentum vetus* and the *instrumentum novum*; the latter has the same authority as the former and comprises the *evangelicum instrumentum* and the *apostolicum instrumentum* s. All these documents are titles conferring full legal rights on the doctrines which derive from them. Tertullian also gives a legal form to the argument from tradition. It takes on the form of *prescription*, thus creating a right of *exception* which exempts from all discussion with adversaries. Tertullian admits that it is possible to dispute occasionally, and he himself does so; but he maintains the right which springs from the *possession* of!

¹ *Apolog.*, 46.

² *De Anima*, 23.

³ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁴ See *Index latinitatis Tertullianæ*. P. L., 2, 1320.

• *Adv. Henn.*, 19, 20. *De resurrect. carnis*, 33, 39, 40. *Adv. Marc.*, 2.

lie truth and which is proper to the Church * The Church's teaching is summed up in the Creed, which is the rule of faith, *regula fidei*, and also legally speaking the law of faith, *lex fidei* 2.

B) The Catholic theologian.

i. Tertullian's Trinitarian theology is chiefly to be found in the *Adv. Praxeas*. On the whole, it shows a considerable advance on the works of his predecessors, especially as regards the Holy Ghost. 1. Tertullian affirms that the Holy Ghost is a *pure spirit*. As Saint Augustine has remarked, the word, *corpus*, which he sometimes employs when speaking of the Divinity, has probably the sense of substance 3. 2. He admits a certain *economy* (οἰκονομία) in God, or in other words, a certain communication of the Divine Being which, without disturbing divine unity, forms the Trinity 4. 3. God is "numerus" and not "unus". Tertullian carefully distinguishes the *substantia divina* (divine nature) from the *substantiva res*, which latter he usually terms *personae*s, and sometimes *species*, *forma*, *genus*. His therefore was the honour of having insisted the now classical formula: *tres personae, una substantia*. He has other not quite so exact expressions, but the error is [in] a question of words than of thought. 4. The *subordinationism* which may be perceived in certain passages is less concerned with the *nature* of the Son, or the Holy Ghost, than with the origin of these Persons, or the functions which are attributed to them *ad extra*. This explains a great deal, if not all, of Tertullian's terminology 7.

Tixeront says that his Christology has all the good points of his Trinitarian teaching and none of its defects. He makes a perfect distinction between the two natures, *substantia*, and undertakes a special defence of the divinity of Christ's human nature against Docetism. He dearly affirms the union of these natures in one Person: "Vide-

I ' See above, *De praescriptione*. See A. U'Ac's on theological prescription in *l'Ann. thiol. de Tertullien*, p. 260-261, M. Perroud, *op. cit.*

■ · *De praescriptione*, 14.

■ ' *IV Genesi ad litt.*, xi, n., 41-43. *P. L.*, 34, 427-428.

I ' See above, *Adv. Prax.*

I *Adv. Prax.*, 7 and *passim*. Hippolytus similarly writes, *πρόσωπον*,—*Cont. I' A'*, 7.

I · *Ibid.*, 2.

I ' Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 1, 403.

mus duplicem statum, non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Jesum !

3. When treating of justification, Tertullian chiefly insists on the idea of *merit and demerit*. Although not neglecting the action of grace, he confines himself more particularly to the relations of master and servant which exist between God and man. Man, by his accomplishment of the divine law, *merits* a just reward (*pretium*). He becomes God's creditor (*petitor*) and God becomes his debtor (*debitor*). By sin, on the contrary, man becomes God's debtor, and thereby has right to *satisfaction, compensation, or penance*, which is no other than the *price* of the sinner's pardon. Such a conception is not very favourable to the soul's intimacy and friendliness with God. If other influences, and especially that of Saint Augustine, had not corrected its excesses, it would finally have withered up Latin theological thought 3.

4. Tertullian did not give to the word Sacrament the strict meaning which it eventually assumed as an efficacious sign of grace. Apart from the classical sense of the *military oath*, he gives to this word a number of extremely diverse meanings, for instance, religion, doctrine, a symbol, prophecy, discipline, and most often *a rite of initiation*, either among the Pagans or among the Christians 4. In the latter, a Sacrament is a sanctifying rite which produces the grace which it signifies. This efficacy of the sacramental sign, however, seems too much bound up with the matter of the Sacrament. Tertullian speaks but little of sacramental form and symbolism. In this case he was probably betrayed by his doctrine of the relative corporeity of the soul 5.

Among the Sacraments of which Tertullian treats we have already mentioned *baptism, penance and marriage* (Confirmation) conferred by the imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross made on the brow of the baptised person following the unction which terminates the baptismal ceremony 6. Tertullian has no more than a rudimentary doctrine

¹ *Adv. Prax.*, 27. For Tertullian, *status* means nature or reality. A. d'Alvi op. cit., p. 81, n. 3.

² See in particular *De Panit.*, 5, 6, 7. *Storpiaci*, 6. *De Orat.*, 3, 4.

³ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, 333-334.

⁴ E. de Backer, *Sacramentum*, p., 6-96.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 156-174.

⁶ *De baptismo*, 8. *De resurrect. carnis*, 8.

"I the Eucharist, but he affirms, nevertheless, the real presence. A few expressions that would seem to indicate the "nity must be put down to that symbolism which it is impossible not to attribute to the species in the *sacramentum i charistiæ*.* Tertullian does away entirely with the *sacrament of Order*, when he declares that every Christian is a priest. It should be noted, however, that he did not Adopt this opinion until after his adhesion to Montanism², mid by virtue of different principles to those of tradition.

5. Tertullian's moral teaching is extremely elevated. He has given "the highest lessons of Christian energy and pride, even to the point of paradox. When he is good, he is Very very good. It may be said that he was really a better *Vmralist* than a *casuist*, and generally speaking his *principles* Bic better than the *application* he makes of them 3". His Inorai teaching is well summed up in the title of "the Hard African" which was given to him by Bossuet. Such strict tendencies finally led him to Montanism 4.

• The Montanist theologians. The principal features of Tertullian's Montanist belief and discipline are: 1. The imminence of the »0 mid coming and the thousand year temporal reign of Christ, which An the prelude to His eternal reign; 2. the reign of the Paraclete and ■ third revelation, destined to abrogate the former revelations and divide nil Christians into two classes, the spirituals (πνευματικοί) and the jp-o hicists or carnal; 3. obligation of facing up to persecution; 4. con- tli'innation of second marriages, even at the risk of straitening Saint Paul's matrimonial legislation; 5. excessive severity in the matter of Luting and other Christian practices; 6. lastly, the doctrine of the three Imtnissible sins and the practice of this doctrine.

I This last point caused Tertullian to go even further: "By his exception ni i <l tain sins from the pardon of the Church, he was brought to deny the jimer of the keys. By restricting the Christian Church to the influence hl the Paraclete alone, he lost sight of all bonds of communion between Hu- members of the Church. The effect of these reforms was to aggravate (In already very real opposition between the Church and the world, and In substitute for a visible and hierarchical Church, heir to the teaching mui power of the Apostles, a Church in which there was no priesthood, M|m any other investiture save that of the Spirit⁶,"

1. Cf. P. Batiffol, *VEucharistie*, p. 204-226.

• i in particular *De prescript.* 41. He calls *ordinatio* the ceremony in which A'iris are conferred.

1 Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 151.

i ie above, *Moral Works*, p. 229 et sq.

Λ. d'Alès, *im théologie de Tertullien*, p. 441-449.

• *Hid.*, p. 492.

CHAPTER VI.

Novatian.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: Z., 3. For the *De Trinitate*, edition W. Y. Fausset, Cambridge, 1909.

2. Studies: A. d'Alès, *Novalien*, Paris, 1925; *EEdit de Callisti*, 1914, p. 297-397. J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 1, p. 338 sq.

I. NOVATIAN THE CATHOLIC.

The first mention of Novatian occurs during the long vacancy of the Roman See which followed the death of Saint Fabian and which lasted from January 250 to March 251, at which date Saint Cornelius was elected. In a letter he sent to Fabius of Antioch, Cornelius paints Novatian in the darkest colours. Novatian was a native of Rome or of Italy. For some time before his baptism he had been thought to be possessed and was exorcised more than once. He was subsequently baptised by the clinici while lying ill. No episcopal confirmation was obtained for this action and he was thus rendered irregular. In spite of this fact and the opposition, of the clergy, the Pope (Saint Pontianus or Saint Fabian), who had been greatly attracted by his brilliant intelligence, ordained him priest. At the death of Saint Fabian he occupied an important position among the Roman clergy.

Novatian was a remarkable writer. Before 250 he had already composed his famous treatise *On the Trinity*. It was the first Latin work ever written at Rome on a theological subject. Its clarity, method and elegance have made it a model of its kind. Novatian was certainly influenced by Tertullian's writings, but in spite of what Saint Jerome may have said to the contrary he did more than only summarise them. In the sixteenth century, the *De Trinitate* was published under Tertullian's name, but the correct attribution was made shortly afterwards.

The purpose of this work² was the explanation of the *regula veritatis*, that is to say the faith of the Roman Church

■ Eusebius, *Hist. Ecl.*, vi, 43.

* P. L., 3, 886-952. See A. d'Alès' abstract, *Novalien*, p. 84 sq.

is it is formulated in the Creed and explicitly concerned with the Father (ch. i), the Son (ch. 9), and the Holy Ghost (ch. 29). The whole book, which is composed of 31 chapters, may be divided into four very unequal parts, which deal respectively with the Father and Creation (ch. 1-8), the Son and the Incarnation (ch. 9-28), the Holy Ghost (ch. 29), and, lastly, the relation existing between the Father and the Son (ch. 30-31).

Novatian's Trinitarian doctrine follows the lines laid down by his predecessors and improves on them in many ways. Although, like Hippolytus, he distinguishes *three states in the Word*, i. e., His eternal generation, His birth, and His Incarnation in time, he does not dwell on them to the same extent. Thus, even although he asserts that the birth of the Son (2nd state) took place at the time that the Father had determined for Creation, the Father was *semper Pater* (by virtue of generation). Tertullian hesitated to admit that the Father is *semper Pater*, but Novatian is very firm on this point². It follows that the Son is eternal. When he states that the Son is hierarchically inferior to the Father, he is usually referring either to that *personal subordination* which results from the divine processions, or to that *ministerial subordination* arising out of the functions attributed to the Son and the Holy Ghost *ad extra*³. Novatian deals very briefly with the *Holy Ghost*. But the Pneumatopetitors were wrong when they concluded that he denied His divinity. Although he does not call Him God explicitly, he ascribes Him all the divine attributes. Elsewhere, he establishes between the Holy Ghost and the Son a relation which differs in no way from that which he shows as existing between the Son and the Father. This parallelism is a strong testimony both to the divinity of the Paraclete and to the procession "*ex Patre Filioque*"⁴.

Novatian played an important part during the vacancy of the Apostolic See (250-251), especially as regards the relations with the African Churches. Of the four letters which he wrote from Rome to Saint Cyprian, and which are

² *Herm.*, 3; *P. L.*, 2, 199-200.

³ *Trinit.*, 16, 31; *P. L.*, 3, 914-949.

⁴ Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 403 (note 1). See also A. d'Alès, *Novatian*, pp. 117, 123, 127, 129.

⁵ *Novatian*, *ibid.*, p. 129.

preserved in the collection of his Letters ' , the thirtieth must certainly be attributed to Novatian, and also probably the thirty-sixth. They treat in particular of the numerous *lapsi*, who had apostasised during the recent persecution of Decius-

Unlike the priests of his Church, who, following the admonitions of the confessors of the faith, made no difficulty about reconciling the *lapsi*, Saint Cyprian adopted a severer rule of conduct which may be summed up in the two following rules: *a*) with regard to the *lapsi* in general, a reserved but encouraging attitude should be maintained if reconciliation is possible and would seem to be expedient; nevertheless, Saint Cyprian awaits for a general recommendation to be made by a Council; *b*) as regards the dying, they are to be immediately reconciled, by a priest or even a deacon; in such cases the recommendation of confessors of the faith is not sufficient.

The Roman Church approved this ruling. "Through the intermediary of Novatian (letter 30), the Roman clergy stressed the ancient severity of the Roman tradition, and prefaced its approval with infinite precautions—diplomatic expressions which seem to reveal an affectation of severity and a kind of reluctance to give pardon. But no matter, there is no doubt about their approval, in spite of their evident preoccupation not to compromise the future".

Letter 36 appears to have been written by the same hand. The Roman clergy "extend to Cyprian the sympathy which is due to him courage and express their indignation at the measures he finds it necessary to repress". It should be noted that there is no question, either at Rome or at Carthage, of altering a rule which, until then, had been regarded as inflexible. Novatian's *severitas antiqua* does not imply a general and definitive exclusion of the "fallen"; not only was no suggestion of this kind ever made "but it would seem that there was unanimity in considering the question as having been decided, on principle, in the contrary sense". The reconciliation of the *lapsi* was regarded as possible.

II. NOVATIANISM «.

Having thus come to the fore during the vacancy of the Apostolic See, Novatian might have been justified in thinking himself the proper person to succeed Saint Fabian. Nevertheless, in March 251, the Roman clergy and people chose Cornelius. Novatian, seeing his designs thus thwarted, went to the opposite camp. He caused himself to be consecrated bishop by three rural bishops, simple and honest men, who at the time, says Cornelius, were half intoxicated

* Ep. 8, 30, 31, 36. P. L., 4, 245, etc.

1. n'Ai.ks, *L'Edit de Calliste*, p. 310 and 311. See p. 306-311.

3 *Ibid.*, 310-311. See also *Novation*, 138 sq.

4 A. d'Alès, *Edit de Calliste*, p. 318-344. See also *La théologie de S/M Cyprien*, p. 299-301.

the wine they had drunk. Novatian then declared that he was the true successor of Saint Peter. In the desire of living some kind of *dottrina* justification to his schism, he took up the principle of unbending severity with regard to the *lapsi*. But this move did not hinder him, in the hope of lengthening his position, from relying on the support of a schismatic group of African *laxists*, whose leader was Novatus, lately arrived in Rome. This personage had been excommunicated by Saint Cyprian and was consequently his enemy. These laxists were soon absorbed, but the term *Novations* (followers of Novatus) continued to serve to designate the *Novatianists* (followers of Novatian). These followers of Novatian travelled the whole Empire in an attempt to persuade the acceptance of the Usurper's claim; they deposed existing bishops and instituted others in their place. In spite of the energy displayed by Pope Cornelius, in abjuration of a number of the schismatics, and the opposition everywhere offered to the Novatianists, notably by Saint Cyprian in Africa, they were successful in creating the last great schism to divide the Church, which lasted close on « centuries. The fundamental note of this sect was the discouragement of sinners, since it taught that penance was useless and pardon impossible. It should be noted that this laxist teaching was never defended in the name of Catholic tradition.

A few of Novatian's writings during this period of his life are extant; in *De cibis judaicis Epistola*¹, certainly authentic, the *De spectatibus* and the *De bono pudicitia*², also probably from his hand³, which, as d'Alès remarks, enable us to "penetrate the interior life of the 'lapsed'". They consist of pastoral letters dealing with Jewish controversies or the general subjects of Christian morality. The author's austere piety was well calculated to attract generous and fervent Christians. It is not known to what period should be ascribed the *other writings* of Novatian which are mentioned by Saint Jerome⁴; on the Pasch, the Circumcision, the high-priest, prayer, persecution, Attala, according to Socrates⁵, Novatian perished a martyr during the persecution of Valerian (257-258), but the value of this testimony is in question.

¹ *R. L.* 3, 953-964. New edit. G. Landgraf and C. Weiman, 1898.

² 4, 779-788 (among S. Cyprian's works). See Mattel's edit.

³ *R. L.* 4, 819-828 (*Liber de disciplina et bono pudicitia*, *Ibid.* J. Hartel's edit.

⁴ It is d'Alès' opinion, who treats the question in *op. cit.*, p. 5-18. This includes all the other writings which have been attributed, even recently, to Novatian, *op. cit.*, p. 19-24.

⁵ *Iris illusi.*, 70; *P.* 23, 681.

⁶ *Ao. Eecl.*, tv. 28; *P. G.* 67, 540.

His death did not put an end to the schism'. On the contrary it developed side by side with Catholicism and only disappeared in the sixth century. That *rigid Christianity* which had sought to impose itself on the Church since the beginning of the third century identified itself with Novatianism. In the year 251, it entered upon a period of great expansion, at a time when the Catholic Church was making great attempts to eliminate it. The *Cathares*, as the Novatianists called themselves before the Manichaeans adopted this name, denied the possibility of forgiveness for sins committed after baptism, especially the three sins. They maintained a strong rigorist current in the West and even in the East. The majority of critics, however, admit that the reservation of the three cases never entered into penitential discipline in the *East*, and severity was always tempered with indulgence, for a long time the West observed a more severe discipline. It would seem that the Council of Elvira can only be absolved of Novatianism by its recognition of the Church's *right* to pardon great sins; but this point is all important. At one time, at the beginning of the fourth century, certain Western Churches even refused reconciliation *in extremis*, but this measure must be put down to particular circumstances.

From the moment of its appearance, Novatianism was combated by the great bishops. The *Ad Novatianum*, written during Novatian's lifetime and wrongly attributed to Saint Cyprian, reproached Novatianism with treason to the Gospel. In the fourth century, it was especially controverted by Saint Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona. Saint Augustine strove with it, at least indirectly, in the form of *Donatism*, whose rigorist teaching attached it to the Catharist movement.

CHAPTER VII.

Saint Cyprian.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: P. L., 4. (Very defective reproduction of the Balu/O Maran edition, 1726). *Corpus* of Vienna, 1868-1871 (edit, prepared by G. HARTEL).

2. Studies: P. Godet, *Cyprien (Saint)*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 2.1« 2470. Freppel, *Saint Cyprien et l'Eglise d'Afrique au IIIe s.* (Paris, 1865. P. Monceaux, *Hist. lût. Afr. chrét.*, 11, Paris, 1897) reproduced in *Saint Cyprien* (coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1914. L. Bayart, *Le latin de Saint Cyprien*, Paris, 1902. A. d'Alès, *La theologie de Saint Cyprien*, Paris, 1922; *l'Edit de Calliste*, p. 297-349. W. Bunsen, *Cyprian, His Life, His Times, His Work*, London, 1897. J. P. K. tei u, *Der hl. Cyprian von Karthago*, Regensburg, 1877. P. Ba Thit ih

' A. d'Alès, *l'Edit de Calliste*, p. 350-395 (*Ein du rigorisme penitentie!* A

" Regarding the sects of the *Cathares* or *Pure Ones* (from καθαροί), I F. VERNET, *Cathares*, in *Did. théol.*, col. 1987-1999.

j'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme, p. 399-484. J. Tixeront, *Saint Cyprien*, in the *Mélanges*, two lectures, p. 176-225. Dom J. Chapman, *interpolations dans le traité de Saint Cyprien sur "L'Unité de j'Eglise"*, in the *Rev. bénéd.*, 1902 and 1903.

I. LIFE AND WORKS UNTIL THE MIDDLE OF HIS EPISCOPATE.

A). Before the episcopate. The Saint's correspondence, the *Vita Cypriani* of his deacon Pontius, and the *Acts* of his martyrdom provide us with rare and detailed information regarding the ten years of Saint Cyprian's episcopate (249-258). Very little, however, is known of the first part of his life. Since he was still a neophyte when he was named bishop, the date of his conversion must have been about 245. Moreover, his rapid elevation to the episcopate and the position that he occupied at Carthage prove that he was then in the prime of life; it is therefore probable that he was born about the year 210. He belonged to the higher middle-class and owned a good deal of property. While still young he was initiated to the humanities, taught eloquence, pleaded, it would seem, at the bar, and made a number of friendships, in the best intellectual and social circles of the town, which were not altogether broken off by his conversion. He was baptised about the year 245. His conversion was in great part due to a venerable priest of the name of Cyprianus. A number of details regarding this priest is given in the *Ad Donatum* 2, a kind of confession and exhortation that Saint Cyprian addressed to a friend some time before his becoming a Christian. Donatus, also recently converted, found great difficulty in detaching himself from the fluid of pleasure and secular ambition. In order to encourage this somewhat lukewarm neophyte, Cyprian did not hesitate to portray the transformation that had been operated in himself by baptism. Grace, he says, which is given to all Christians has been stronger than the attractions of nature, and has given him victory over his passions, together with peace and happiness. As a crowning endeavour to draw his friend away from the world, Cyprian then makes a satirical description of Pagan society, and terminates with an ardent exhortation.

1 In *Ijartel*, 1871, p. xc-cx. L., 3, 1481-1498. For the Acts see *ibid.*, M-1806.

Kf i; L., 4, 192-223; P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 53-63

tation. Cyprian's dramatic introduction and his highly finished portrait of Pagan manners prove that he had not yet altogether rejected the aid of rhetoric, in spite of his resolution to renounce it.

A profound change took place in Cyprian's mode of life, Almost at once he made a vow of continence, and sold a great part of his possessions in order to give to the poor. He was ordained priest two years later, and in 249 he succeeded to Bishop Donatus in the See of Carthage'.

B). Beginning of the episcopate (249-251). Tixeront remarks that Cyprian as bishop can be summed up in one word: he was a leader. "He was a man of government and authority before whom all inclined, even those he did not command... During the nine years of his episcopate, Saint Cyprian, without constraining anyone, without any encroachment on the rights of his colleagues, by means of his personal influence and skill, was able to group around him the hundred or so bishops who governed the African Churches... According to the name that was given him, he was not only the Bishop of Carthage, but also the Pope of Africa: *Papa Cyprianus...*" The work of centralising the African Churches, which he had begun, was terminated at the moment of his death. He was also a real leader with regard to the government of his own Church, knowing well how to condescend without suffering any diminution of his authority. The majority of his writings were pastoral work and give "an exact notion of his attentive and practical mind; he was a man who, in his government, successfully combined discretion and strength."

Four writings, dating from the beginning of his episcopate, show how he studied both for himself and for the enlightenment of his flock. We possess a number of notes which he took on his reading at that time: probably the "Apologeticum" of Tertullian and the "Octavius" of Minucius Felix. He did no more than rapidly summarise the chief ideas of these authors together with the proofs which they gave, often enough in their very words. The *Quod idola dei non sunt* consists of still less notes, and that is the explanation of the imperfect form of this writing. So also disappears the chief difficulty of those who contested its authenticity. The bishop's purpose in making these extracts was to have his arms ready at hand. Moreover, Tertullian was one of his favourites.

* P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 8-11.

* J. Tixeront, *Mélanges*, p. 158-160.

† J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

‡ P. L., 4, 564-582. See P. Monceaux *op. cit.*, p. 62-68, on this treatise.

ihors, whom he read every day, whom he called his master and to whom he often went for guidance. In many ways his treatise *On the Habit of Virgins* (*De habitu virginum*) (249) is no more than an imitation of Tertullian's "De virginibus velandis" (206), but he tempers many of the latter's excesses. His style is inferior to Tertullian's but he gives more and more prudent advice. The same must be said of two of Saint Cyprian's later writings, which are reproductions, even to the title, of two of Tertullian's works: *De Oratione* (252); *De bono patientie* (256).

Like Tertullian was not his only master. It was from the study of the Scriptures that he derived the most profit. Here, also, he probably used the same method as before, copying down outstanding and important passages concerning the defence of the Church and the practice of Christian duties. Thus, when his friend Quirinus, asked for some writing to complete his instruction, he did no more than group together and co-ordinate a number of biblical quotations in the form of books and chapters, the title of each chapter containing a summary of the thesis leading to a well thought out plan: bk. I, provisional character of the Jewish Law; bk. II, fulfilment of the prophecies in Jesus Christ; bk. III, Christian faith, duties and virtues. The two first books form a kind of reply against the Jews, while the third is more of a Christian disciplinary and moral code. Such is the *Ad Quirinum* or *Testimonia ad Quirinum* (249-250), a simple collection of texts, extremely precious for the study of the history of the Latin Bible. This Christian manual enjoyed lengthy favour in Africa.

From the month of January 250, the pastoral action of the new bishop was greatly disturbed by the persecution of Decius. He decided to go into hiding, either for the purpose of not compromising his flock, or of being able to continue the direction of his Church. His flight caused dishonour, and later he had to justify himself before the council of Rome, which had remonstrated with him (letters 8, 9, 20). He remained in retirement until Easter 251, providing for the needs of his clergy and people by means of active correspondence. He was obliged to oppose in a special manner the claims of the numerous lapsi who, taken by surprise in the unforeseen persecution, had ceded to Imperial pressure. They were not long in realising the gravity of their lapse and wished to return to the Church, but without doing penance and only on the recommendation of the confessors. Many of them found priests easygoing enough to receive them. But Cyprian, although he did not deprive them of all hope of forgiveness, recalled the rights of

1/ 4, 440-464. See P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, 120-122.

! 41 521-544 (*De oratione dominica*).

i 4, 622-638. On this and the preceding treatise, see *ibid.*, 122-129.

/■ 4, 675-780.

the hierarchy, and rejected all new procedure pending a decision of a Council. He submitted his decision to the Church of Rome, which by the intermediary of Novatian approved his way of acting*.

II. EPISCOPAL CONTROVERSY (251-258) AND THE WRITINGS OF THIS PERIOD.

A) Penance.—The Unity of the Church.

On his return to Carthage after Easter 251, some little time after the election of Pope Cornelius (March 251), Cyprian convoked the African bishops to a Council: about sixty responded. The Carthaginian clergy, the faithful, and even a large number of the “*lapsi*” themselves assisted at the sessions. Cyprian read a long relation to the assembly regarding the measures to be taken with regard to the guilty ones and the conditions of their pardon: this was the *De lapsis*¹, addressed to the *lapsi* in order to prove the necessity of penance, and to the bishops for the direction of their decisions. The latter conformed to Cyprian’s desire: no corporate submission; only the *libellatici* were to be reconciled immediately; the others were obliged to perform a lifelong penance; nevertheless permanent reconciliation is to be accorded in case of persecution and in danger of death; clerical “*lapsi*” are deposed. Those who refuse to do penance cannot be pardoned, even at the moment of death.

Another question had to be settled by the same Council: that of the schism. From the moment of his election, Saint Cyprian had no counter to five priests, led by Novatus who, far from submitting as they went on, gained more followers. Among these was *Felicissimus*, a man rich enough to finance the party. The bishop temporised as long as he could, but in the face of open revolt was obliged to excommunicate them all. Novatus, who was at Rome during the election of Cornelius, allied himself with *Novatian* against the lawful Pope.

Cyprian, who meant to have the measures he had taken against the schismatics confirmed by the Council, had composed a second relation, even before his return to Carthage. This is the *De Unitate Catholicæ Ecclesiæ*³, composed of 27 chapters. It is possible that a first text composed originally with a view to the local schism was recast by Saint Cyprian before the Council took place, in order to defend the unity of the Church also against the Roman Schism. This would explain the two known recensions of chapter IV and the special stress which the second recension lays on the privilege

¹ A. d’Alès, *L’Edit de Calliste*, p. 297-335.

³ P. L., 4, 465-494. Among the *lapsi* it was usual to distinguish the *saitif* who had really sacrificed to idols, and the *libellatici*, who by some means procured a certificate (*libellus*) testifying, untruthfully, that they had sacrificed.

³ A. Z., 4, 495-520.

i) Peter. Such is the interesting theory of Dom J. Chapman, which, however, is subject to many objections. Unlike Bossuet in his sermon on the *Unity of the Church*, Saint Cyprian did not intend to show that this Catholic unity, safeguarded by the Roman Primacy, is compatible with various intangible privileges of certain great national Churches, or the episcopate as a whole. Faced with schism, his purpose was to establish that the unity of the Universal Church, founded on Peter (ch. 4), is incompatible with the *plurality of the hierarchy*, given the singleness of episcopal power (ch. 5). The bishop's intervention in the Council of Carthage went with complete success. He procured the excommunication of all the schismatics and rallied the whole of Africa to the cause of Pope Cornelius against Novatian. The African schismatics persisted in their error, and set up another Adversary in the person of Fortunatus, who, however, was quickly discredited, as was also Maximus, the other pseudo-bishop of Carthage, who soon gave his name to the partisans of Novatian.

i B). Relations with Rome.—Diverse initiatives.

I The correspondence which subsequently took place between Cornelius and Cyprian witnesses that they had a number of misunderstandings, but never any real disagreements. Cyprian's letters are not those of an underling asking for favours; they are letters of a colleague believing himself to be entitled to quit himself rightly in combining boldness with defence (ch. 4). He does not hesitate to tell the Pope what he

intends to do. Yet the letter which tenaciously defends the rights of the episcopate also pays magnificent homage to the Chair of Peter: *Petri cathedram atque... Ecclesiam... quia palem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est* s.

It was during the pontificates of Cornelius (251-253) and Lucius (253-254) that the African Church was ravaged by the plague from which the Empire was destined to suffer for twelve years. Cyprian applied himself to the task of sustaining the courage of the faithful, and it was the purpose of the pastoral letter entitled *De Mortalitate*

A. 1: Acts, *La théologie de Saint Cyprien*, p. 97-102.

(Cyprian's doctrinal exposition, p. 262.

ii) Letters 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 57, 59, 60 (from Cyprian); letters 49, 50 (from him). See A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 146-172.

✓ (P. L. 3, 818-821). See *ibid.*, 120-126. 4, 583-602.

(252). He also dealt efficaciously with the calumnies of the Pagans who charged the Christians with being responsible for the pest. A violent and troublesome Pagan named Demetrianus, who was particularly active in this direction, drew an especially sharp answer from the bishop: the *Ad Demetrianum* is a "pamphlet, full of eloquent animation and satire". Cyprian also gave himself to the work of encouraging the miseries attendant on the plague and exhorted his flock to increase their alms (*De opere et eleemosynis*, 253 circa).

The last years of Saint Cyprian were marked in particular by his disagreements with Pope Stephen (May 254-August 257). We know of these from nine letters included in the Saint's correspondence (Ep. 67-75). In the first (Ep. 67) he replies to two Spanish Churches, which had consulted him, that their bishops, who had apostatised during the persecution, are lawfully degraded and that it is useless for them if remain in office by virtue of a decision of Pope Stephen. Cyprian thought that the Pope had been misled. Since it was impossible for him to have violated a law sanctioned by his predecessors, his decision is therefore void. Letter 68 is addressed to Stephen himself. Cyprian reproaches him with being too tardy in taking measures against the Novatianist Bishop of Arles, in spite of the request made by the Bishop of Lyons. Apart from its peremptory tone, this letter implies that Cyprian and the Bishops of Gaul "attributed an all-embracing supremacy to the Popes". The following letters (69-75) concern the *baptismal controversy*.

C). The baptismal controversy. When the heretics began to organise independent sects, the Church was faced with the question of the validity of the baptism they administered. Montanism and Marcionism were the first to cause this difficulty. Their baptism was regarded as valid at Rome in Palestine, and probably at Alexandria, but in Latin Africa at Antioch, in Cappadocia, and in Cilicia, on the contrary it was rejected as being invalid and the converts from heresy were re-baptised. The influence of the Roman procedure raised doubts in the minds of the African bishops, and Cyprian, consulted in 255, replied that the African custom was right. The following year, seventy-one bishops, when he assembled in Council, approved this decision. It was communicated to Pope Stephen in a *synodal letter* which was drawn up by Cyprian himself (Ep. 72): after having explained

1 P. L., 4, 544-564. See P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 69-77.

2 P. L., 4, 601-622.

3 The greater part of this correspondence is to be found in P. L., 3, under the title *Concilia Carthaginensia*, column 109 sq. See A. Leclercq, *La Théologie de S. Cyprien*, p. 173-210.

4 See also P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 451-454.

5 A. Leclercq, *ibid.*, p. 183. See P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante*, p. 4, 14

6 Ep. 69 (to Magnus), 70 (synodal letter: P. L., 3, 1035-1044), 71 (to Quirinus)

icel the resolutions which had been taken, and the motives
 <or each, the letter concludes that the African episcopate,
 illthough not desirous of imposing its views on others, has
 he firm intention of not changing its opinion on a point
 egarding which each bishop is free *.

Some time after, in *another letter* (Ep. 73) to a bishop of
 Mauritania, Jubaianus, he explained in more detail the ana-
 baptist thesis (those who re-baptised) and refuted therein the
 anonymous treatise *De Rebaptismate* which upheld the con-
 iary thesis, together with another anonymous document,
 probably a letter from the Pope to the Mauritanian bishops.
 On the 1st September, 256, he presided at another Council
 > eighty-seven bishops, who again decided against the
 Roman usage.

At this, Stephen made up his mind to intervene. Of the
 Pontifical Rescript all that remains is the principal phrase,
 filed by Saint Cyprian:... *nihil innovetur, nisi quod traditum*
tst... \ nothing to be introduced which is not contained in tra-
 ction 3. The letter by which Cyprian communicated this
 decree to the bishop Pompeius (Ep. 74) 4 is still extant,
 [yprian complains bitterly and gives a refutation of the
 rope's thesis, whose decision he did not regard as being
 definitive. The better to defend the position he had taken,
 Cyprian wrote to Firmilian or Caesarea, who gave his full
 Approval and repeated in an even greater measure Cyprian's
 Own recriminations (Ep. 75) 5.

I | he Pope had threatened Cyprian with excommunication,
 >H it would not seem to have been fulminated. Saint
 Rlcphen died in the midst of the baptismal controversy
 'August, 257). From the moment of his successor's election,
 Ilxtus II (257-258), ecclesiastical relations continued without
 llfi rruption, and there was no need to negotiate for their
 illcwal, a proof that they had never been broken off. The
 |ru Pope left to the passage of time the work of persuasion;
 lily years later the whole of Africa had adopted the Roman

* 'ihi in re nec nos vim cuiquam facimus aut legem damus, quando habeat in
 n l .l.l. administratione voluntatis suæ arbitrium liberum unusquisque præposi-
 I, i i.inem actus sui Domino redditurus. Ep. 72, 3; Zt L., 3, 1050.

* / /.., 3, 1183-1204.

Pl"i the sense of this formula, see A. n'Al.fcs, *La théol. de S. Cybrien*,
 388.

I !... 3, 1128-1137.

- ' /..3.1153-1178.

usage. As for Cyprian, he always thought he was in the right, and there remains nothing to prove that he modified his opinions in any way before he died.

During the persecution of Valerian, a few days after Stephen's death, the 30th August 257, he was exiled to Curubis, on the coast near Carthage, where he remained a year and carried on the government of his Church. It would be here that he composed a little treatise on the duties of Christians in time of persecution, at the request of Bishop Fortunatus; the *Ad Fortunatum*²³ consists of a collection of biblical texts, arranged according to a given plan which was Cyprian's usual procedure. About the same period, perhaps before his exile (256-257), he wrote against "jealousy and envy", from which he himself had suffered at Carthage, his treatise *De zelo et livore* which is a pitiless exposure of these vices.

He was recalled to Carthage in September 258 and on the 13th he was arrested, and the following day he was decapitated in the presence of all his people. There is nothing to equal the splendid simplicity of the death of this great bishop, all the details of which are known to us by the *Acts* of his martyrdom. Saint Cyprian will ever remain "one of the finest episcopal figures in Christian history"⁴. Should it have happened that during his life he gave way to certain weaknesses, more or less unconsciously, he made up for them all by the shedding of his blood.

III. DOCTRINE OF SAINT CYPRIAN.

A). Synopsis of his works and doctrine.

a) The chief feature of Saint Cyprian's doctrine is the Church; we will deal with this in the first place, according to the *De Domestica Ecclesia*.

b) His teaching on the Sacraments is also important, especially regarding Penance, which is treated in the *De lapsis*.

c) The remainder of the treatises are concerned with Christian morality, with the exception of two which deal with apologetic subjects (*Quod idola dii non sint*, about 249; *Ad Demetrianum*, 251). Leaving these aside, the moral works are as follows: 1) *Ad Donatistam* & about 249; 2) *Testimonia ad Quirinum*, about 249; 3) *De habitu virginum*.

¹ A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 206-210.

² P. L., 4, 651-676.

³ P. L., 4, 638-652.

⁴ P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 46. See *ibid.*, 44-46.

oum, about 249; 4) *De oratione dominica*, 252; 5) *De mortalitate*, 252; 6) *De opere et eleemosynis*, 253; 7) *De bono patientia*, 256; 8) *De zelo et timore*, 256; 9) *Ad Fortunatum de exhortatione martyrii*, 257.

The *correspondence*, comprising 81 letters, many of which, however, are letters received by Cyprian, is a valuable source of information, not only as regards the Saint's life and character, but also as regards the principal points of his *doctrine*.

B) The Church. Love of the Church is one of the distinguishing traits of Saint Cyprian. It was this love that gave rise to the immortal expression: *Habere non potest Deum patrem qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem* (*De Unit.* 6). Nevertheless his teaching on the unity of the Church and his conception of Catholicity, so rich in many ways, is subject to serious objections and qualifications.

The expression "Catholic Church" may mean either the *universal* Church or the *true* Church, even local, if used in opposition to the schismatics. These two senses were usual in the time of Saint Cyprian. "But in most instances both Cyprian and his contemporaries take *Ecclesia Catholica* in the sense of *universal Church*"³. And this universal Church is not; it is catholicity itself: This conception of catholicity was not an invention of the Bishop of Carthage, "but it is nevertheless true that, faced with heresy, Cyprian was the first to elaborate a dogmatic view of the Church; in the proper sense of the word, he is the *first theorist of catholicity*"⁴. Unfortunately his theory was imperfect and failed to move all by its lack of homogeneity. His ideas are classed under two heads, the function of the successors of Peter, and the episcopal college; these two sometimes appear to be in opposition.

i) The successor of Peter, a) Chapter 4 of the *De Unitate Ecclesie* is undoubtedly the most formal expression of the primacy of the successor of Saint Peter ever made by Saint Cyprian. The author sees the Church torn by schism, and he mourns for it. He asks himself what is the cause of this evil, and finds it in the forgetfulness of the firm constitution that Christ had given to His Church. *The Church is united on Peter*, and since Peter is one, the Church is one

¹ Bayard, S. Cyprien, *Correspondance*, I, Paris, 1925.

² The work wrongly attributed to Saint Cyprian, see below, p. 288.

³ ii) Alte, *La thiol. de S. Cyprien*, p. 159. See p. 155-159. 212-214. *IM.*, 214.

also : *super unum ædificat Ecclesiam* * The fact that Christ subsequently gave to the other Apostles a share in the power I that he had originally given to Peter makes no difference, I The Church is still founded on Peter, and continues to fulfil J that unity which Christ intended as her essential attribute.

b-) It is only when he speaks of the Bishop of Rome that I Cyprian employs the word *primacy* (*primatus*). This title I is mentioned not only in the second recension of the *De Unitate*, I which is recognised as authentic by all the critics, but also in I many other writings 1.

c) It is not only a *primacy of honour*; it has also an extremely active function as the chief factor for the presci · I vation of Catholic unity. This is proved by various texts. I The most remarkable of all is found in Letter 59(11. i.)i, I which shows us the African schismatics taking refuge *ad Pet> I cathedram, atque... Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdo I talis exorta est*. To Cyprian's mind, Rome possesses tlx, I chair of Saint Peter. Its Church is "principalis", that is In , say, it possesses a *primacy* which makes of it the source <U unity for the entire sacerdotal body '.

2. The episcopal college. Concurrently with the text- which exalt the function of Peter and his successors, is to Im found a great number of others which assert the claim to ilio autonomy of the episcopal college. It is not certain whether this idea is to be found in the *De Unitate* (in ch. 5) which II especially devoted to recalling to mind the unity of episcop-

1 The first recension has: *super unum (edificai Ecclesiam*. The second wB more detail: *super ilium ædificat Ecclesiam*. In *P. L.*, 4, 499, the two formulæ are combined, after the early manuscripts: *super illum unum*.

9 See in particular Letters 69, 71, mentioned above in reference to the bapllfl mal controversy. In the second, Cyprian asks the Pope to give way in llllM question under discussion, as Peter gave way to Paul at Antioch, without insinti- on the rights of the primacy, which were not placed in doubt *P. L.*, I j

*Two expressions in this formula have been variously understood, a) I-tf *principalis*, three explanations are to be noted : 1. the first, based on the menni- of excellency, considers it as an indication of an *authority* in the Church ; mu li ll the traditional Catholic explanation; 2. the second regards it only as an ηllκKH to chronological *anteriority*; sudi is the opinion of numerous critics, admitted]- Mgr. Batiffol; 3. a third and recent explanation, based on the etymologi- meaning of the word *principalis*, cleverly combines the two preceding explanation by showing that a *permanent principle of unity* resides in Rome ; this i* I- opinion of A. d'Al Ès, *op. cit.*, p. 388-395. b) *Exorta est*, in the past ten- does not exclude a present action, but unites the past to the present, im.m]- that in *all times* all the Churches have turned to Rome for guidance.

A. 6'At.fcs, *ibid.*, p. 124.

power shared equally by all the bishops as a whole, and individually *{in solidum}*⁸. But it is expressed in several other letters, particularly letter 50 addressed to Cornelius on the subject of the schism, and in all those that are concerned with the baptismal controversy. It should be remarked, however, that this autonomy is far from being regarded as absolute, without limits or control. "The control belongs to all the bishops *as a body*; the body of bishops legislates with full powers in order to restrain all recalcitrants to the territorial limits of their jurisdiction" 2. The bishop always depends on the episcopal college, whose decisions he must accept on pain of excommunicating himself. Cyprian counts on the goodwill of the pastors and the grace of the Holy Ghost to preserve unity of opinion. It is not clear whether Cyprian regarded this episcopal autonomy as being limited only to disciplinary questions, or whether he thought of it as being also extended to doctrinal matters.

3. Conclusion 3. What can we infer from all this?

a) It cannot be said with Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, that Saint Cyprian is a believer in the absolute independence of each bishop 4.

b) Neither can it be asserted with A. Sabatier 5 that Saint Cyprian, by his insistency on the unity of the episcopal body, has himself planted in this system "the seeds of a new evolution, by virtue of which this head of the episcopate, this bishop of bishops, against whom he endeavours to defend himself, will spring from the body of bishops." Such seeds existed long before Cyprian, and he himself definitely recognised the fact, both by his mention of the privileges of the Apostolic See, and by his perpetual recourse to that same

§ It would appear difficult, however, to admit that Cyprian fully understood all that the privileges of Peter imply. It is permissible to hold that he separated himself from the Pope only on a question of discipline, but it cannot be held that with him there was "a divorce between theory

⁸ *ipse unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur. De Unit., I 17* ... 4, 501. See A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 131-132.

² *Ibid.*, 214 sq.

⁴ A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 211-223.

⁵ W. Henson, *Cyprian, his Life, his times, his work.* London 1897.

⁶ *Les religions d'autorité et l'évolution de l'esprit*, Paris, 1904. See p. 177-179.

and practice, imputable to the will alone." As A. d'Alès says, "With such a man, the breakdown took place in the sphere of theory; he is inconsistent in practice, precisely because his intelligence has erred ¹", Cyprian was unable to deduce all the consequences of the principle he had laid down; that is the simplest solution. These shortcomings must be laid to the charge of his late conversion and his rapid Christian formation. He did not grasp all that the privileges of Peter's successor implied with regard to *rights* for the Pope and *duties* for the bishops. He had no desire to separate himself from the former, but he counted on the *collective action of the episcopate* to enlighten and assist him. Meanwhile he showed himself stubborn, struggled and resisted, at the risk of causing an open conflict. He himself did not escape scot free, and this in itself reveals the incoherence of his principles.

d) By the reaction he provoked (at the end of the third century all Africa had accepted the Roman usage) not less than by his doctrine, Saint Cyprian contributed to the clarification of certain consequences of the principle of the Roman primacy, which he himself had presented as the basis of *Catholic unity*, not only in the order of faith, but also in that of hierarchy and government. His partial error must not occlude all that he did for the great cause of unity, as *Saint Augustine* reminded a Donatist bishop: "si sane Cypriani... te delectat auctoritas... cur in eo non delectat, quod unitatem orbis terrae atque omnium gentium et diligendo tenuit et disputando defendit?" ²³

C). The Sacraments', i. As with Tertullian, the word sacramentum has many different meanings in the works of Saint Cyprian. Besides the military oath, it has the sense of a *sacred thing* in general (mystery, doctrine, precept), or a *figure* or religious symbol, or, lastly, a *sacrament* in the present theological sense. Taken in this last meaning, it is applied especially to the three sacraments of Christian initiation, *baptism*, *confirmation* and *eucharist*. Cyprian also speaks of the power of *order*, the distinguishing mark of the sacerdotal class, *an penance*, by which sinners are reconciled. He insists on the *holiness* of Christian marriage, while exalting virginity and celibacy, practised for the sake of Christ. He does not treat of *extreme unction*.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 220-223.

²³ *Ep.* 93, n. 36; see *ibid.*, 36-42. The unity here referred to by Saint Augustine is the unity of the Universal Church, *unitatem Ecclesia toto crescentis*. *Ibid.*, 40; *P. I.*, 33, 339-342.

³ A. d'Alès, *La thiol. de S. Cyprien*, p. 84-89.

Two very controverted subjects in his time, concerning baptism and penance, should be noted.

2. Baptism. In the baptismal controversy, Cyprian was *led into error* by a tradition of the African Churches. Theoretically he defended it, on the principle that baptism is the property of the Church, and only those who are members of the Church have the power to use it; consequently heretics may lay no claim to it. Moreover, Cyprian "regarded the person of the minister in the light of a vessel from which grace is poured out on to souls." He wrongly maintained that the reasons he averred were stronger than the custom which was opposed to them: *non est autem de consuetudine præscribendum, sed ratione vincendum* '. In the absence of a complete theological teaching on these matters, which did not then exist, Stephen possessed the traditional Catholic feeling on the subject of baptism. This it was that kept him to the right path and procured his ultimate triumph 2.

3. Penance, a) In the matter of the *lapsi*, Saint Cyprian required that repentant apostates should be submitted to a penance before being absolved by the Church. But this pardon was not refused, and there is nothing to lead us to suppose, that in according it, the Church of Rome, or that of Carthage, had in any way reformed or opposed a contrary discipline.

I li) The administration of penance comprises three *elements*: 1. *confession* made to a priest (Saint Cyprian recommends that it should be extended to interior and secret sins, and gives to it the name of *exomologesis*, which word had previously been applied to satisfaction by Tertullian); 2. *satisfaction*, by means of the penitent's voluntary expiation; 3. *reconciliation*, performed by the priest, either exteriorly before the Church or interiorly before God. This absolution which is called *pax*, *remissio*, *communicatio* is given by the priest. lii) Laying on of hands in *poenitentiam*, and is accorded only after the performance of penance '.

I). Moral teaching. With regard to the use of the word "sacramentum", Fr. d'Alès remarks that "mysticism is one of the most outstanding and charming features in Saint"

' 7b 3; P- L-, 3, X106.

1 A. d'Alès, *op. cit.*, p. 237-242.

" A. d'Alès, *ibid.*, p. 272-302. See also *Edit de Callisto*, ch. X.

Cyprian's work¹. His letters are a proof of his mystical and affective turn of mind: "They are all happily inspired by the harmonies of the visible and invisible world, of nature and of grace ²", Such mysticism is certainly the outcome of his moral life, and that undoubtedly is Saint Cyprian's proper sphere. He was a moralist above all things; not so much a theorist as a *pastor*, preoccupied with leading his flock to faith and the practice of the virtues.

The foundations of this moral teaching may be found in a condensed form in the third book of the *Testimonia ad Quirinum*, which reduces all the duties of a Christian to the perfecting of the three theological virtues of faith, hope and charity; and in the *De oratione dominica* ³ which, before giving a commentary of the Pater, insists on the necessity and the general conditions of *prayer*. Cyprian realises the power of *grace* in drawing the newly baptised away from the mediocre life of the Pagans ⁴.

The particular virtue which he recommends is *charity*, which puts a stop to envy, and inclines the Christians to succour their more unfortunate brethren ⁵. He also treats of the holiness of virgins and draws up for them a plan of the perfect life⁶; he praises *patience* and exhorts his flock to practise this virtue when the Empire is ravaged by the plague ⁷. Before he died in the persecution, he outlined the theology of *martyrdom*, both in the letters he sent to persecuted Christians, and in a little treatise which is truly an introduction to martyrdom ⁸. The firmness and solidity of this moral teaching reveals a great and noble character, deeply penetrated by the love of Christ.

¹ A. d'Alès, *La théologie de S. Cyprien*, p. 85.

² *Ibid.*, 84. See also by the same author in *Rev. Asc. et Myst.*, 1921J p. 256-268.

³ This valuable little treatise comprises three parts: the first, ch. 1-6, treats of prayer in general; the second, ch. 7-27, explains the seven petitions of the Pater; the third, ch. 28-36, indicates the conditions for perfect prayer, and tends to the necessity of praying not only by day but also by night: "Qui autem in die et nocte, hoc est in lumine, semper sumus, nec noctibus ab oratione cessemus... Nued quasi in lumine ambulemus" (ch. 36). *P. L.* 4, 542-544.

⁴ *Ad Donatum*, *ibid.*, 328.

⁵ *De zelo et livore: De opere et eleemosynis.* *Ibid.*, 347 sq.

⁶ *De habitu virginum.* *Ibid.*, 342 sq.

⁷ *De bonopatentia; De mortalitate.* *Ibid.*, 351 sq. & 33^ sq.

⁸ *De exhortatione martyrii.* *Ibid.*, 336 sq.

CHAPTER VIII.

The last writers in the West.

I. COMMODIANUS.

It would seem that Commodianus wrote during the second half of the third century 2. *Africa* is believed to have been his adopted country, on account of his name, his language mid the numerous references to Saint Cyprian that may be found in his works. He calls himself a *mendicus Christi*, which may mean either an *ascetic*, or "one who begs for Christ"; the latter would explain the pertinacity with which he solicited the alms of the faithful. He was perhaps connected with the episcopal administration, since the title of *gasaetus*, which he gives himself, could well be applied to a *hinsurer*. He was never more than a simple layman. He had been for a long time a member of several false religions before he was finally converted to Christianity.

Two of the works of Commodianus are extant: the *Instructiones adversus gentium deos*, and the *Carmen Apologeticum*. 1. The *Instructiones* are a collection of 80 pieces, all acrostics with the exception of two, each one composed of from 6 to 48 lines. These are contained in *iw hooks*. The first (1-41) is written against the Pagans and the Jews; the second opens with a concise eschatology, and goes on with a number of moral and disciplinary counsels addressed to various classes of Christians. 2. The *Carmen Apologeticum* contains 1060 lines and is an exposition of the Christian religion. It treats successively, and sometimes erroneously, especially as regards the Trinity: «) God, Christ, revelation (89-578); i) the necessity of faith for salvation (579-790); ii) the last days (790-1060). On the last subject Commodianus has made

1 * Editions: P. L., 5, 201-262 (only the *Instructiones*). Corpus of Vienna, p. 1, (Ed. B. Dombart). Studies: J. Durel, *Commodien*, Paris, 1912; *Les in , actions de Commodien*, Paris, 1912 (translation and commentary). See P. Monceaux, *Hist. Utt. Afr. chr.*, in, p. 451-489. P. DE Labriolle, *Hist. fill hit. chr.*, p. 204-251. Freppel, *Commodien, Arnobe, Coetanees*, Paris, 1893. 1 The critics hold extremely divergent opinions on this point; some fix his [H....] in the middle of the 3rd cent. (Ebert, Boissier), at the beginning of the 4th (Kraus), between 280 and 350 (Hamack), in the second half of the 4th (Maas), and even between 458 and 466 (Brewer). P. DE Labriolle says ■ " I.J. Bardenhewer prefers the years 251-258, during the episcopate of H. I yrian. This is also the opinion of J. Tixeront and A. O'Al.fes, etc. See n i Ai ks, *Commodien et son temps*, in Peek. Sc. Pel., 1911, p. 480-520, 599- Bin I + I. B. Pit ra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, 1, 21 sq.

the most complete description which ever sprang from the imagination of the millenarianists: the ministry of Elias, return of Nero, the Anti christ and his persecution, his defeat by an Eastern king who persecuted the Jews, and who for them is the Antichrist; the entrance of the saints into Sion, the final catastrophe, *millenium*, and finally paradise; he describes all that with the enthusiasm of one of the elect and the (precision of an eye-witness '.

From a moral point of view, Commodianus was generous and unselfish, but of an independent character, and so outspoken that at times he was really rude; when writing of the Pagans and the Jews he does not stint his use of *stultus*, beast, and similar epithets; even the Christians do not escape, for he regards them as only too ready to avoid the severity of Christ's law. From an intellectual point of view, he was but poorly educated and in no wise a philosopher. Neither had he any literary pretensions. Having come from the people, he wrote for the people. As P. Monceaux remarks, his works contain as fine a collection of solecisms as was ever dreamt of by the worst latinist. His prosody is even more faulty than his grammar; there are only 37 verses, which scan correctly in the whole of the "Instructiones", and in the "Carmen" no more than 26. His language is lively and metaphorical, but he lacks "all artistic perception: apart from a few happy expressions the whole work is flat, dry and unskilful" 3. His doctrinal authority is extremely insignificant.

II. ARNOBIUS THE ELDER³.

Arnobius the Elder (so called that he may be distinguished from a similarly named Roman monk, a contemporary of Saint Leo) was for a long time a rhetorician in Africa, at Sicca in Numidia, where he had Lactantius as a pupil. His only Christian work, the *Adversus Nationes*, consists of an apology, composed for the most part at the time of his conversion. Arnobius had been a Pagan, convinced to the point of superstition, and his love of the gods was so strong, that it moved him to combat the Christians. About the year 295, however, he suddenly asked to become a cate-

1 P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 479. P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 239-242.

2 P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

3 Editions: P. I., 5, 7181288. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1875 (ed. ReiflersehriS], Studies: P. Monceaux, *Hist. Utt. Afr. chr.*, in, Paris, 1905, p. 241-2811, P. de Labriolle, *Hist. litt. lat. ch.*, p. 252-267. F. Gabarron, *Amobe, rom æuvre*, Paris, 1921; *Le latin cPAmobe*, Paris, 1921.

humen. The Bishop of Sicca in Numidia was naturally surprised at such an unforeseen change, and imposed on the indidate a public avowal of his sincerity. Arnobius decided that nothing could serve this purpose better than a written refutation of the calumnies to which the Christians were subjected, especially with regard to the plagues which were then overrunning the Empire. After the appearance of the first two books on this subject, the bishop allowed him to be baptised. But the author, having begun so well, made up his mind to do still better. He opened a vigorous attack on Paganism itself in five other books which he added to the "Adversus Nationes". The date of his death is unknown. Saint Jerome appears to think that it was in 327.

Arnobius, in his criticism of Paganism, made great play with *irony*, an arm which the Apologists have often used against their adversaries. He was a Voltaire on the side of the angels, having the same richness of language, but less subtle, more verbose and pompous. From this point of view his erudition is profound, and extremely valuable for the study of history or archaeology. As regards *Christianity*, however, his work has but little interest. He had no more than a superficial and notion inexact knowledge of his religion. He was unacquainted with the Scriptures, or nearly so; often enough his religion seems to be little more than a vague spirituality. The author's conversion probably came too late to achieve a complete reversal of a mentality which had run for so long in other grooves. There is no need of insisting on his theological shortcomings; he represents Christian tradition only in a very imperfect measure. He is too much of a philosopher, even although he sometimes scoffs at the value of reason.

III. LACTANTIUS

Lucius Caecilius Firmianus, or *Lactantius*, was a man of mediocrity, in spite of his literary qualities which have rightly earned him the title of the Christian Cicero. Born in Africa about 250, he attended the lessons of Arnobius at Circa. He quotes the latter in none of his works. He also took up the teaching of rhetoric, not without some success, since in the year 292 he was called to teach at Nicomedia, which had been an imperial town since Diocletian. But as his Latin lectures attracted very few young men in

Editions: *P. L.*, 6-7. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1890-1897 (Ed. Brandt and Völschlin). Studies: R. Pichón, *Lactance*, Paris, 1901. J. Tixeront, *Tr. Dogm.*, I. p. 336 et passim. P. Batiffol, *La paix const. et le catt.*, I. i. l. nt sq. P. Monceaux, *Hist. lit. Apr. chr.*, in, p. 287-359. P. de La-
III i. K., *Hist. lit. lat. chr.*, p. 252-253, 268-295.

this Greek town, he occupied his leisure time in writing. After his conversion about 300, he retained his title "I rhetorician and continued to live in Nicomedia during the first years of the persecution which began in 303. After Diocletian's abdication in 305 or 306, he had to take flight. Although never in the hands of the torturers, he suffered greatly from poverty and at times was quite destitute. II.' probably returned to Nicomedia after the publication of the edict of tolerance of Galerius (311). His last years were passed at the Court of Constantine, where, in 317, he was employed as tutor to the Emperor's son, Crispus. It would seem that he died at Trier, but the date of his death is unknown.

A great number of his works which are now no longer extant are cited by Saint Jerome". According to Pope Damasus, many of them were extremely long and tiresome. Those now extant, dating from after his conversion, are not without interest; they are all written with an apologetical purpose, and one of them, the *De mortibus persecutorum*, is almost historical.

The first Christian work composed by Lactantius was probably the *De opificio Dei* (302-305); therein he refutes the Epicurians who are too inclined to regard man as a creature unworthy of God: if anything is lacking in man, his reason makes up for it (*qua desunt ratio repine ditur*); moreover, his physical organs are perfectly adapted to their end and his spiritual soul was created by God alone.

The chief apologetical work of Lactantius is to be found in the *Divinæ institutiones* 4 (304-315), the very title of which is a sufficient indication of the author's methods. It is held that the most useful apology did not consist in the refutation of calumny and philosophical systems opposed to Christianity, but in a straightforward exposition of the truth. His work was meant for the well educated; hence the elegant and careful style of his writing. The whole work consists of seven books, of which the *first three* are a sort of religious catechism. I. There is only one God; polytheism is absurd. II. Religion is necessary, and Paganism is not the true religion, in. Philosophy is not a substitute for religion. In the four following books Lactantius exposes Christian doctrine: in the IVth, dogma, and the truths which must be believed (God, Christ, miracles, the Incarnation, the heresies).

1 *De viris ill.*, 80; *Et* 84 and 23.

2 *P. L.*, 7, 9-78.

3 *De opifi.*, in, 5.

* *P. L.*, fs, 111-822.

the Church); in the Vth and VIth, moral teaching, and justice in particular; and in the VIIth, the last ends. As may be seen, the *Institutiones* form an elementary summary of Christian teaching. It was further abridged by Lactantius himself in a later edition, the *Epitome I*, which is still extant. Its authenticity is admitted by nearly all the critics.

Voltaire pointed out and scoffed at the grave critical shortcomings in this writing. The belief of Lactantius in the Sibylline Oracles must be put down to credulity, as well as the matter of fact way in which he describes all the phases of an imaginative eschatology; he was quite openly a millenarianist. His theology was very ordinary. It is to his credit that, although he himself was a poor philosopher, he had confidence in philosophy. What is really new in his writings is his deep sense of the "moral efficacy of Christianity, and all that it has meant (or the renewal of the human soul)".

The *De ira Dei** and the *De mortibus persecutorum* so different as they are on the subject, resemble each other in certain ways. The *De ira Dei* was written for the purpose of refuting an objection which the Epicureans and the Stoics had made against Holy Scripture: God is impassible; He cannot be moved to anger. Arnobius, unable to solve this problem, had acquiesced to it. Lactantius answered it, not from a philosophical but from a juridical point of view: God is the master; He rewards the good, and punishes the evil; His anger is the act by which He punishes the sinner.

The *De mortibus persecutorum* forms the complement to this teaching and shows God as the avenger of crime, even in this life. This apologetical work is based on facts, for, as M. Monceaux observes, it is also historically exact, and especially as regards the contemporary events which take up the greater part of the book (ch. 7-52). In the first six chapters the author exposes the retribution which befell the great persecutors (Nero and Domitian in the first century; Valerianus and Aurelianus in the third). The remainder of the work treats of events since the time of Diocletian. It dwells on the miserable fate of the tyrants: Severus opens his veins (26); Maximinus hangs himself (30); Galerius is bitten by worms (35); Diocletian dies in the utmost destitution (43); Maximinus Daia poisons himself (49). It has been pointed out that this part of the work is more animated, more dramatic and more interesting than the rest. In spite

* I /, 6, 1017-1094. Addressed *Ad Pentadiuni fratrem*. It consists of 1017 lines.

• I' UK Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 279.

• /■ 7, 79-148.

I /' 7, 189-276.

of his normal temperament and turn of mind, the author was carried away by his subject. /

Lactantius is not a profound and original thinker. But he at least realises that the early *philosophers* possessed a number of universally exact and useful ideas, and that it is possible to correct and complete their views by Christian teaching. In the *Institutiones* therefore, he endeavoured "to put in evidence the rational aspect of Christianity, and insist on her agreement with the best philosophical thinking of all previous ages". He preferred to adopt this method rather than study dogma in the light of philosophy; he was more of an apologist than a *theologian*. As for the form, Lactantius always remained a rhetorician, who regarded the great writers of antiquity as oracles, and gave more importance to the classical form of expression, modelled on that of the Masters, than to originality of thought and vigour of style. Nevertheless, his works were composed with great perfection, and the purity of his language has won him many admirers since the Renaissance.

IV. SAINT RETICIUS OF AUTUN.

Saint Reticius, Bishop of Autun at the end of the third and at the beginning of the fourth century, seems to have been one of the most influential persons in Gaul in the time of Constantine. Saint Augustine, who calls him *Homo Dei*, infers his great authority from the part he took in the Council held at Rome under Pope Melchiades in 313 in which Donatism was condemned. He also assisted at the Council of Arles (314), which renewed the Roman condemnation. Saint Augustine (*loc. cit.*) quotes one of his expressions on original sin. According to Saint Jerome, it would appear to have been taken from the voluminous treatise *Contra Novatianum*, now no longer extant. Neither does anything remain of a *Commentary on the Canticle*, also mentioned by Saint Jerome (*ibid.*) who regarded the work as very ordinary.

V. SAINT VICTORINUS OF PETTAU⁴.

Saint Jerome tells us that the earliest Latin exegetist was his Illyrian compatriot, Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau on the Drave in Styria (Austria). He spoke Greek better than Latin, and this is revealed by his exegetical work. He commented three books of the Pentateuch (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus), three prophets (Isaías, Ezechiel, Habacuc), Ecclesiastes and the Canticle of Canticles; in the New Testament, Saint Matthew and the Apocalypse. Saint Jerome, although naturally favourable to him, did not try to cover up his shortcomings. Victorinus with

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 1, p. 346.

⁵ *Contra Jul.*, I, 7. *Opus Imperf. c. lat.*, 1, 55.

³ *De viris ill.*, 82.

⁴ Editions: P. L., S, 301-344. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1916 (Ed. Hausleithner). Study: P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 295-300.

⁵ *De viris ill.*, -jy

* *Ep.*, 70.

frankly a millenarianist; this can be seen from the only extant fragment of his works, the end of the Commentary on the Apocalypse, discovered in 1895.

We are also informed by Saint Jerome that besides his exegetical works Victorinus had also composed a treatise Against all the Heresies, no longer extant. Harnack believed he had discovered it in the shape of the *Libellus adversus omnes hæreses*, which is to be found (without justification) among Tertullian's works. This attribution is based on uncertain grounds; Harnack himself admits that it would be better to place this work about the year 220, shortly after the composition of the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus, with which it has much in common.

A ninth century manuscript (cod. Lambeth, edit. Cave, 1688) ascribes to Victorinus the treatise entitled *De Fabrica Mundi*. There is no serious objection to this attribution, which is confirmed by the matter and the style. The author therein comments the beginning of Genesis and lays stress on its moral and religious teaching. It is the only extant work of Victorinus. Dom Morin's attribution to Victorinus of the *Fragment of Muratori* is no more than a pure hypothesis, which as yet has never been definitely proven. The majority of critics still regard this as a scriptural canon as having been composed about the year 200.

CHAPTER IX.

The last Oriental writers of the third century.

I. SAINT DIONYSIUS OF ALEXANDRIA.

A). Life and works. Saint Dionysius of Alexandria, surnamed the "Great" from the fourth century and also perhaps by his contemporaries, appears to have been, like Saint Cyprian, a man of action. He was born about 190-200 of a noble family, and converted after much study and deep reflection. He was one of Origen's pupils and was placed in the head of the Didascalia when *Heraclas* succeeded Maximianus about 232. There he remained until he also was elected to the See of Alexandria in 248-249. It is possible that he continued to teach after his elevation to the episcopate.

1. *Didascalia*, P. G., 5, 301-316.

Editions: P. G., 10 (ed. Galland). C. L. Feltoe, *The letters and other liturgical writings of Dionysius of Alexandria*, Cambridge, 1904. Studies: 1. Bury, *St. Dionysius of Alexandria*, Paris, 1910. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 1, (1st edit.), 1893, 433-439 (2nd edit.), p. 476 and 484 sq. C. Verschaffel, *Denys d'Alexandrie* in *Diet. theol.*, col. 425-427. J. Lebreton, see below, p. 278, n. 1.

pate. Only the title or a few fragments of the works he composed at this time are extant: 1. *On Nature*, a refutation of Epicurian materialism based on the atomism of Democritus, and a demonstration of the doctrine of Creation, 2. *On Temptation*; concerning exterior trials and persecution; 3. *Commentaries on Ecclesiastes* (preserved in a great measure in a "Catena" 2 and on Saint Luke 3.

The fifteen or sixteen years of the episcopate of Saint Dionysius (248 or 249 to 264 or 265) were filled with bitter trials, and he was concerned in all the great controversies of his time. He escaped the persecution of Decius by taking flight. On his return he was obliged to refute *millenarianism*, which had been propagated in Egypt by Nepos, an adversary of Origen, and all forms of allegorism; this refutation it contained in his work *On the Promises* (253-257) in which he also gives a mystical interpretation of the Apocalypse (which, however, he does not attribute to Saint John). Saint Dionysius also took part in the question of the lapsi and Novatian's schism, by the intermediary of his *Epistles* he recommended that the sinners be treated with the greatest forbearance, and exhorted Novatian to submit to the legitimate Pope. Later, at the time of the *baptismal controversy*, again sent counsels of peace and moderation to both parties, but it would not seem that he fully realised the great dogmatical importance of the issue. Every year he sent to all the Egyptian Churches a festal letter (ἐπιστολαὶ ἑορταστικαὶ) dealing with the celebration of Easter, the preliminary fast, etc. That of the year 251 contained a pascal cycle for seven years. Another letter to the Bishop of Pentapolis, Basilides, dealing with the length of Lent and the physical conditions required for communion, has become one of the *canonical epistles* which form the sources of Easter Church Law: it contains four canons.

During the persecution of Valerian, Dionysius was exiled to Libya and later to Mareotis. He did not return to Alexandria before March 262. His opposition to Sabellianism begins at this period. This heresy, although condemned by Callistus, had continued to spread in the East and had taken on its final form, evolving from *patripassianism* to *modalism* properly so called. Dionysius warned the Egyptian communities against this error. But various expressions which he uses in two letters to the bishops of the Pentapolis seem to show that he admitted a substantial distinction between the Divine Persons and a real subordination.

1 P. G., 10, 1249-1270.

* P. G., 10, 1577-1588.

1 P. G., 10, 1589-1602.

* P. G., 10, 1237-1250.

* 15 letters. P. G., 10, 1271-1344.

* Of the books *Adversus Sabellium*, only the fragment quoted by Eusebius is extant. *Prop. Evang.*, vii, 19. See P. G., 10, 1269-1272.

li' of one to the other. He was denounced to the Pope, 'lnt Dionysius (259-268), who, after a Roman Council had hen held (262), asked him forati explanation. He immediately furnished this in a letter, and then in a long work in l"tir books, entitled *Refutation and Apology* (Ἐλεγχος καὶ Απολογία) L His declarations seem to have satisfied the l ope. If he was ever in fault, he quickly repaired his error.

These difficulties never impaired the esteem in which he Was held in Egypt and throughout the East. On his return lii'in exile about 262, he was faced with a great deal of misery and desolation in his diocese, resulting from the civil War and the accompanying evils of famine and pestilence. rk< was unable to assist at the Council held at Antioch in [f>.] to deal with Paul of Samosata, but he sent a letter i; linst the reformer. Shortly afterwards he died. His exile limed for him the title of *martyr* in the Eastern Church, lis strong character, his brilliant intelligence, as well as the η at influence he exercised, have rightly entitled him to be idled *Great*. He was a man of government and a man of l«trine, in spite of certain very real defects in his theology.

B . Doctrine. The criticisms which are levelled at the 'imitarian teaching of Dionysius chiefly concern the Son, lliose *eternity*, and *consubstantiality* with the Father he >|>eared to deny. It is averred that he separated the Son foni the Father to such an extent that he made Him no i"t< than a *creature* adopted by God. He had in fact madel expressions which at a later date were employed by i- Arians: "there was a time when God was not the Father, Dil when the Son was not: ην ποτέ οτε ουκ ην". Moreover l his attribution of the title of hypostasis to each of the Ilyine Persons, whose reality was denied by the Sabellians, i T It the impression that he taught a true *tritheism*. To il. accusation, already made against Hippolytus, may be winced all the charges against Dionysius².

Saint Dionysius of Rome, after having rejected modalism, ivi-rely condemned the imprudent theories wich divided the lidhead and made a creature of the Son. In so doing he

¹ Inly the fragments quoted by Saint Athanasius are extant in his treatise *De i Dionysii*. See D. I., 'C, 117-128.

² Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, i (9th ed.), p. 485-486. J. Lebketon, *Le η </de la foi populaire et de la théologie savante dans l'Eglise du 111' siècle, ft.*: *Hist. Etc.*, 1924. p. 6-11.

was not speaking as an argumentative theologian but as head of the Church, making an authoritative appeal to Tradition. He put his trust in the early formulas of the faith. He acted the part of judge and witness of tradition, leaving his own personal qualities as a scholar out of the question; Saint Leo at Chalcedon would not have done otherwise.

His very opportune intervention led *Saint Dionysius of Alexandria* to correct or give a more precise meaning to his dangerously ambiguous expressions. This he did aid a theologian and philosopher, drawing largely on Origen; 1. the Son is *eternal*, since light cannot be without splendor, 2. He is consubstantial with the Father, but Dionysius avoided the expression *δμοούσιος*, which is not to be found in the Scriptures; 3. the Persons must not be separated, and he teaches the "Trinity in Unity and the Unity in Trinity;" (¶ he declares that he never thought of the Son as a *creatura* since the word *ποιητή* as applied to the Father with regard to the Son, can bear quite another sense to that of *creator*). It may be asked whether the Bishop of Alexandria had really erred and whether his apology was in the nature of a recantation. Saint Athanasius, who is the only channel through which we know what remains of the writing, is inclined to be indulgent. Saint Basil is more severe. This serious controversy shows how imperfect was Trinitarian speculation on the Trinity before the Council of Nicaea, Origen's teaching was not always the best guide.

II. THE LAST OF THE ALEXANDRIAN AUTHORS OF THE THIRD CENTURY.

A). The successors of Saint Dionysius at the Didascalia were :

1. *Theognostus** directed the school from 264 to 280, and composed a kind of dogmatical summa, entitled the *Essays* (Hypotyposes) in series of books; this was based on Origen and imbued with his ideas.

2. *Pierius* was a famous teacher under Bishop Theonas (282-311) and head of the catechetical school. He deserved his title of *On'gi the Younger*. His writings seem to have consisted of collections

* See J. Lbbreton, *ibid.*, p. 9.

¶ J. Tixeront, *of. cit.*, p. 487-488.

3 O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, II, 158-219. J. Tixeront, *Hist.* (1st ed.), p. 413-419. L. B. Radford, *Thru teachers of Alexandria*, 71 *gnostus, Pierius and Peter*, Cambridge, 1908.

4 P. G., IO, 239-240; and *Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1902.

* P. G., IO, 241-246; *Texte u. Unters.*, v, 2 (1888).

innons; only a number of the titles and fragments are extant. His sermon on the *Mother of God* at such an early period is worth mention.

3. *Saint Peter of Alexandria*, bishop of that town from 300 and martyred in 311, abandoned the path trodden by his predecessors and took up a firm stand against Origen, whom he controverted especially in two writings, of which there remain only a few fragments: *^refutation* of the thesis on the *pre-existence of souls*, and a treatise *On the Resurrection*. The *Canonical Epistle* (14 canons) preserved in the collections of Eastern Church Law, is a fragment of the lost treatise on *Penance* (c. 306) which was probably no more than a festal letter. His works *On the Godhead* and *On the Coming of Christ* are entirely lost.

B). A number of other Alexandrian or Egyptian writers, not mentioned in the Didascalia, are worthy of mention.

1. A few letters of *Ambrose* a friend and disciple of Origen and brother of his adversary, Demetrius, are extant.

2. *Anatolius*, native of Alexandria, Bishop of Laodicea in Syria about 268, was the author of various works *On the Pasch*, on theology and mathematics.

Phileas Bishop of Thmuis in Lower Egypt, who died a martyr in 306, left a number of letters.

4. *Hesychtus* revised the Septuagint and the Gospels, and was severely criticised by Saint Jerome.

5. *Hieracas* is the first Christian author to have written in the 'optic tongue. He was the head of a large community of religious of both sexes at Leontopolis in the Delta. He composed a *Hexaameron* and a number of new psalms. His exaggerated allegorism caused him to fall into a few errors.

6. *Nepos*, Bishop of Arsinoe, was millenarianist and wrote against the *allegorists*. He was refuted by Dionysius of Alexandria.

Ammonites may have been the author of a synopsis of the Gospels and a "Harmony between Moses and Jesus" (It is probable that there were several authors bearing the name).

A certain Tryphon left several exegetical works mentioned by Saint Jerome.

III. SYRIAN AUTHORS.

A) In Palestine.

1. *Julius Africanus* (*Sextus Julius Africanus*) was not born in Palestine, in spite of the indication given by his name. A fragment of the

¹ 6^e, 18, 467-522; and Pitka, *Analecta Sacra*, IV, 189-193, 426-429.

² Hlikron, *De Piris*, 56. See S. Salaville in *Diet. Hist.*, col. 1086-1090.

³ *G.*, 10, 209-236.

⁴ *G.*, 10, 1561-1568.

⁵ *IIIH.*, *Haer.*, 67.

⁶ *De Piris III.*, 57.

⁷ Fragments preserved in *P. G.*, 10, (Incomplete). See F. Amann, *Index*

⁸ *Gn.* in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1921-1925.

"Embroideries" discovered in a papyrus of Oxyrynchus would seem to show that he was a native of Jerusalem. As an officer in the army of Septimius Severus he campaigned in Osrhoene (195), where he became acquainted with the King of Edessa. Later, after having travelled a great deal, he settled down at Emmaus-Nikopolis, where he occupied an important situation. He was not a priest, and mixed a certain amount of superstition with his Christian belief. He was one of Origen's correspondents, and one of his letters ¹*(extant) to the latter denies the authenticity and the canonicity of the story of Suzanna. Origen replied about 240 and proved to him that on the contrary all the deuterocanonical passages in Daniel are authentic. Another of his letters, a part of which is extant, deals with the genealogy of Christ. He died between 240-250. His chief works are the "*Embroideries*" and the "*Chronicle*".

The "*Embroideries*" (Κεστοί) is a kind of encyclopedia of the sciences, war, medicine, agriculture, magic, etc. This work is purely secular in nature, although Julius was a Christian when he composed it in the time of Septimius Severus.

The "*Chronicle*"², of which only fragments are extant, is more important. It is a kind of universal history, the first ever to be written by a Christian. It was largely used by Eusebius, and was the source of all later Byzantine writing of history. The purpose of the work was to show the chronographical anteriority of the Christian religion over the Pagan fables. After a theoretical introduction, the author, taking the Bible as a base, draws up a *chronological* list of sacred and profane historical facts since the beginning of the world. According to his calculations, Christ was born in the year 5,500 after the Creation, and the world was to come to an end in 6,000. Julius finishes his history in the year 5,721, the 221st of our era, the third year of Elagabal.

2. *Saint Pamphilus* * was one of Origen's most fervent admirers. He was born at Beryta and studied at Alexandria under Pierius, and then lived at Caesarea in Palestine. It was here that he opened a theological school, after his ordination to the priesthood; he augmented the fine library which Origen had founded, and had numerous copies of the Bible made from the Hexapla. He revised and corrected these himself.

Thrown into prison under Maximinus, he occupied his time in composing an *Apology for Origen* in five books, to which Eusebius, his collaborator, added a sixth³. This work, which was dedicated to the Christians condemned to the mines, defended Origen's theology against the many attacks to which it was beginning to be subjected. Only the first book is extant, in the faulty Latin translation of Rufinus.

Pamphilus died a martyr in 309. According to Eusebius, his friend, collaborator and biographer, he was an eminent priest, adorned with all the virtues.

¹ P. G., II, 41-48.

² P. G., 10, 45-46.

* P. G., 10, 63-94.

³ P. G., 17, 541-616. (*Apology for Origen*, translated by Rufinus).

⁴ Saint Jerome attributed the whole of this work to Eusebius, but the latter clearly states that it was written in collaboration with Pamphilus. *Hist. l'.* I, vi, 33, 4.

B) At Antioch.

1. Malchion', sometime professor of rhetoric, became a priest and head of a "Greek" or philosophical school at Antioch'. He is best known for the part that he took in the Council held in 268 against Paul of Samosata. He it was who caused the bishop to fix the precise expression of his doctrine, thus determining his condemnation. Saint Jerome says that it was he who wrote the circular letter by which the council made the affair known to the whole Church, and of which an extract is quoted by Eusebius. The principles which characterised Malchion's teaching are unknown. It is possible that he was concerned in the founding of the School of Antioch, a rival to that of Alexandria, although the former is usually connected with the name of Lucian.

2. Saint Lucian of Samosata, his native country, or of Antioch where he was a priest, was a close partisan of Paul of Samosata. After the latter's condemnation, he remained, together with priest Dorotheus, at the head of a group of monks, excommunicated by Paul's three successors, Domnus, Timeus and Cyril. Finally, however, he made his submission to the latter and was received into the Church where he remained peacefully until his death. He was martyred in 312, at Nicomedia under Maximinus Daia, and thus deserved to be venerated as a saint.

About the year 260, Lucian founded the famous School of Antioch. Taking Origen for his model, he gave himself to the study of the Bible. He also made a recension of the Septuagint, which, like the versions of Origen and Hesychius, became so popular that it was given the name of *common recension* (*χτ.Α.*). Unlike Origen, however, he seems to have had an exegetical rather than an apologetic purpose. His exegetical method was sensibly different from that of Origen, especially with regard to the importance he gave to the *literal sense*. The excesses of Origenist allegorism justified this attitude, and the Aristotelian philosophy which Lucian preferred to Platonism, so dear to the Alexandrians, also inclined him to this method. It was perhaps more worldly

I ' G.. IO, 249-260.

' Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, vu, 29-30.

I ' *lie Viris ill.*, 71.

I · Routh, *Reliq. same*, iv, 1-17. For Saint Lucian, see O. Bardenhewer, *Ke>. hichle...*, π, 235-241. F. Prat, in *Diet. Bibl.*, col. 403-407. L. Pirot, */ >||< exigitive de Thiodore de Mopsueste*, Rome, 1913, p. 14-23. G- Bard Y, */■ ymbole de Lucien d'Antioche et la formule du Synode " In Encaeniis "* (341), in *h. Sc. Rel.*, 1912, p. 139-155, 230-244. P. BATIFFOL, *La passion de saint / > i « d'Antioche*, in the " *Compte rendu* " of the *Congris scient, intern, cathol.*, B'iiii., 1891, p. 181-186.

than Origen's, but it might also have been much safer. Unfortunately, he lacked two of those profound forces which always guided the best of the Alexandrian teachers that mystical *elan*, so needful in the development of a Christian and theological sense and *docility* to the voice of tradition as expressed by the magisterium of the Church.

Dating from this moment, the subordinationist tendencies, which are to be found, in spite of the official teaching of the Church, filtering into theological speculation before the Council of Nicaea, began to develop more especially at Antioch, even in a greater degree than at Alexandria, when Origen's disciples had been guilty of a number of indiscretions. Later Arius appealed to the teaching of Lucian and called all the old *collucianists* to his aid. It may be asked whether he was justified in doing this, and whether Lucian is really the Father of Arianism. O. Bardenhewer² together with Duchesne and J. Tixeront, affirms that such is really the case. Others, such as Baronius, exonerate him entirely, or at least reserve their judgment³. There is but little doubt, however, that during the first part of the fourth century it was at Antioch, and especially among Lucian's disciples that the most violent advocates of Arianism were to be found⁴. The master's influence, and probably his specific teaching would seem to be responsible for this in a large measure. If we are to believe Sozomen⁵ one of the symbols of the synod *In Encaeniis* of Antioch⁶ is a profession of faith made by Lucian. This attribution is not based on sure grounds. It is nevertheless probable that this profession of faith reflects the ideas of the founder of the School of Antioch⁸.

IV. ASIATIC AUTHORS.

i. Firmilian of Caesarea (d. 268) occupied a distinguished place among the bishops of Cappadocia and all the East, Any works that he may have written are now lost. All that

² See Introd., p. 28.

³ *Geschichte*, II, p. 237.

³ See F. Ca VALLERA, *schisme a'Antioche*, Paris, 1905, p. 4-5.

⁴ See below, Book II, p. 313.

⁵ See Eusebius on Lucian, *Hist. Eccl.*, viii, 13, ix, 6; and saint Jerome, *2^d Viris ill.*, 77. — ⁶ *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 5.

⁷ See below, p. 310.

⁸ See G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

i. extant is one of his letters written to Saint Cyprian (h.p. 75) dealing with the re-baptising of heretics.

2. Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus², Bishop of Néocaesarea in Pontus, was born in that town about 213 of rich but Pagan parents. Having finished his studies in letters and law in his own country, he was about to go, together with his brother Athenodorus, to Beryta, in order to complete his law studies at the famous school of that town, when a providential circumstance led him to change his mind. The two brothers were visiting Caesarea in Palestine for reasons connected with their family affairs (233), when they met Origen and were at once attracted by the depth of his teaching. For the space of five years they remained at the tent of this unrivalled master. In 238 they decided to return home. On the eve of their departure Gregorius read Origen's academic address, very youthful in its enthusiasm but nevertheless sincere. He thanked God for having given him such a master, and thanked the master for having given his pupils a taste for sacred science. Such is the *Λόγος προσ-Ἰερ/ητ', κο' ε' Ὀριγένην*», extremely valuable on account of the biographical details regarding its author. On his return to Néocaesarea, Gregorius became the first bishop of his native town. He led the life of an apostle. Unfortunately our knowledge of it is extremely limited since the *Life* written by Saint Gregory of Nyssa a century later, as well as another anonymous biography, was of a very legendary character. He converted the whole of his episcopal town. All the very many miracles which are ascribed to him are a proof of his great influence. He assisted at the Council of Antioch in 264 and died about 270.

Although his life was spent in the missionary field, he never lost that taste for theological speculation which he had acquired in his youth. This is proved by the writing known as the short symbol⁴. It is entirely Trinitarian, and has no fidelity to Christology. It owes more to metaphysics than to the Bible. The Trinitarian teaching is worthy of notice:

¹ Found in the works of S. Cyprian. *P. L.*, 3, 1154-1178.

Editions: *P. G.*, 10, 983-1104. For other editions see each work in particular. Studies: V. Ryssel, *Gregorius Thaumaturgus, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Leipzig, 1880. See the authors mentioned in the following notes.

² *Pat. G.*, 10, 1051-1104. New edit. KOBTSCHAU, *Des Gregorios Thaumaturgi Unikrede an Origenes*, Friburg im Br., 1894.

⁴ *Confessio fidei*; *P. G.*, 10, 983-988 (or Hahn 185).

the *distinction* of the Persons, their *equality* and their *eternity* are all clearly affirmed '.

Gregory composed another short but important work, known as the Canonical Epistle 1*. It was occasioned by troubles arising out of a barbarian invasion of the Pontus. The last and eleventh canon is especially instructive. It embodies the discipline which was applied to different classes of penitents in Asia Minor. Gregory mentions four of these! 1. They are to *weep* outside the doors of the church; 2. *listen* to the explanation of the Gospel in the porch of the church and leave at the same time as the catechumens; 3. *prostrate* themselves in the church in the place of the catechumens; 4. lastly, when they are allowed to assist at the ceremonies, together with the faithful, they must not receive communion until they have been definitely reconciled. Saint Basil adopted a similar discipline. In Syria, Egypt and in the West this procedure does not seem to have been followed; the penitents were classed with the catechumens until their complete reconciliation.

Besides the above mentioned writings the following works of Saint Gregory are extant: 1. A *Metaphrasis* or *Translation of Ecclesiastes* to which the title of paraphrase would have been more suited since Gregory treated the sacred text with a great deal of liberty. 2. A treatise dedicated to Theopompus *On the impassibility and the possibility of God*†, which was probably written before he became a bishop. Cast into a philosophical mould, it undertakes to show that although God is impassible in Himself, He is not disinterested in human acts; moreover, this same God took on the form of man and became passible, and allowed Himself to be impassible by his triumph over death. Works no longer extant are: 1. Saint Gregory's letters mentioned by Saint Jerome; 2. a dialogue with Aelianus, spoken of by Saint Basil; in which the Sabellians averred they had found their teaching. Various apocryphal writings, bearing his name, were due to a considerable extent to the Apollinarists‡. Most of his homilies must also be regarded as apocryphal§.

† See J. Labbreton, *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1924, p. π and J. Tixeront, *Œuvres de Saint Grégoire le Grand*, I, p. 491.

* P. G., 10, 1019-1648. See A. d'Alès, *Idée de la Catéchèse*, p. 364 and J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I, p. 503.

† P. G., 10, 987-1018.

‡ Edit. P. de Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, Leipzig, 1858, or Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, IV, Paris, 1883.

§ *De Viris ill.*, 65. — 4 Ep. 210, 5.

¶ See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, n, p. 283 sq. or P. Godet, in *DMH*, art. *Grégoire de Nio-Cisarie*, col. 1846.

“ See M. Jugie, *Les homilies morales attribuées à saint Grégoire le Thaumaturge*, in *Analecta Bolland.*, 1925, p. 85-95.

3. Saint Methodius J, Bishop of *Olympus* in Lycia (Asia Minor), is best known for his dislike of Tertullian, on account of which Eusebius omitted him from his History. In consequence very little is known of his life. He was highly educated, loved the classics, and imitated them with a rare talent. Most of his works are dialogues in the manner of Plato whom he took as his model. From a *doctrinal* point of view he is noteworthy for his strong attachment to tradition, which led him, long before the Arian controversies (for he died a martyr in 311), to take up a firm stand against Origenist speculation.

His works unfortunately have greatly suffered from the passage of time. Many of them are lost. Others have been conserved, at least in part, in Greek and in a ninth century Slavonian translation. They may be classed as apologetical or theological writings, and exegetical and moral works.

The apologetical work, in the proper sense of the term, comprises six *terai* works *against Porphyrium*, greatly esteemed by Saint Jerome. These are no longer extant. Fragments (in Greek) of the dialogue *On lieewillz*, a refutation of *Gnosticism*, are extant. It was Origen, however, who especially attracted his attention. Socrates 4 mentions a lost dialogue entitled *Xenon* which refuted the doctrine of creation *ab eterno* mid which is probably the same as the treatise *On Creatures* mentioned by Photius⁵. Equally lost is the refutation of the homily on the "P'ytho-nissa", in which it seems that Origen admitted the reality of the apparition of Samuel. There still remains, however, in Greek and notably in Slavonian, almost the entire text of the great dialogue in three books *On the Resurrection*⁶, entitled *Aglaophon*, the name of a doctor or Tatar, in whose house the discussion took place. Aglaophon, Proclus mid Origen deny the identity of the glorified body with the mortal body, while Eubulus and Memianus defend the doctrine of the Church.

Although Methodius is opposed to Origenist allegorism, he himself had recourse to it in a number of *exegetical fragments*, extant in Slavonian, in doing with: a) the discrimination of *foods*, and the *red cow* mentioned in *Ixviticus* (or rather *Numbers*, xix); b) the law regarding *leprosy* (11/17. XIII); c) the *leech* (*Prov.* xxx, 15); and "the *heavens* which show forth the glory of God" (*Ps.* xvm, 2). It is probable that he also combined a spiritual interpretation of the *Cantic of Canticles*, as Origen had done before him, but this work is no longer extant.

1. Editions: P. G., 18, 27-408. *Corpus* of Berlin, 1917 (edit. N. Bonmimch). Studies: J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I (1st edit.), p. 420-424; (Ūlulu I. p. 478 et sq. N. Bonwetsch, *Die Théologie des Methodius von Olympus*, Jililin, 1903.

2. *I. J.* 48, 13 and *Ep.* 70, 3. — P. G., 18, 239-266.

3. * *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 13.

4. *Hibl.*, col. 235.

5. *I. J.* G., 18, 265.330.

As regards his ascetical and moral writings, a *Discow st on Martyrdom* or *the martyrs*, now lost, is attributed to him. The Slavonian version contains a short work *On Life and Wisdom* ¹, consisting of an exhortation to use the things of this world as though they were only lent to us, and to put all our hope in the things to come. The best of the moral writings of Methodius is certainly the famous dialogue of *virginity*, entitled the *Banquet*². It is modelled on Plato and the whole is extant in the Greek text.

Ten virgins partake of a festival meal in the garden of Arete (virtue), and each in turn extols Christian virginity as the most excellent thing in Christian life. Arete awards the palm to the eighth, Thecla, who then intones a hymn of thanksgiving to Christ as the Bridegroom of the Church (in 24 verses). In spite of a certain monotony due to unavoidable repetition, this work is to be admired for its elevated sentiments and the depth of mystical feeling shown by its author, as well as for the many aspects of the subject which are dwelt upon.

Virginity makes the soul *like* to God³, and to Christ. Who is the king of virgins (ἀρχιποφΟενο) as He is also the prince of priests, prophets, pastors and angels⁴. Virginity is a *gift of God*, of Wisdom, and of the septiform Spirit, Who alone can renew mankind and lead it to perfection⁵. As a *gift of God* it is the most pleasing oblation that can be made to Him, a sacrifice offered on a golden altar^{6*}. It is a lily and a martyrdom⁷. It represents the triumph of constancy in the struggle between the spirit and the flesh⁸. This aspect is so well developed by Thecla that it brings her the victory. In many passages the influence of Origen's allegorism is plainly to be seen.

Methodius did not possess Origen's genius, but he was certainly the foremost theologian of his time.

¹ Edit. Bonwetsch, *Methodius von Olympus*.

² P. G., 18, 27-220. See C. Caryl, *S. Methodii Patarenis convivium virginum*, Paris, 1890.

³ *Conviv.*, I, 4.

⁴ *ibid.*, I, 4, 5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, in, 8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, v, 4, 8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, vn, 1-3.

⁸ *Ibid.*, vin, 2, 17.

CHAPTER X.

Anonymous writings
of the Third Century.

I. EASTERN ANONYMOUS WRITINGS.

A). *De recta in Deum fide* In this remarkable work, consisting of five dialogues, a certain *Adamantius* takes up the defence of Catholic truth. First, against two Marcionites who uphold their teaching of the two or three principles (Dial. i and 2), and then against a follower of Bardesanes, who, supported by the Valentinians, exposes the Gnostic theories on the origin of evil, and affirms both the Incarnation and the resurrection of the body to be impossible. The Eutropius, chosen as arbiter, declares himself convinced by Adamantius and is converted. The author of this dialogue was undoubtedly thinking of Origen when he wrote "Adamantius But it cannot be admitted, with Saint Basil and Saint Gregory, that Origen himself was the author, since the mention of Saint Methodius of Olympus in his work effectively rules him out. The date of the work must be fixed during the opening years of the fourth century, and it was probably composed in Syria. The author was a sound theologian and well acquainted with philosophy. His teaching is quite different from that of Origen, but there is no hint of any controversial intention with regard to the latter.

I H). The *Didascalia Apostolorum* (Διδασκαλία των Apostolorum) purports to be the *Catholic teaching of the Twelve Apostles and the holy Disciples of Our Saviour*. It consists of a collection of moral and disciplinary precepts, and represents the first known attempt at forming a *Corpus* of ecclesiastical law. It contains 25 or 27 chapters according to the Berlin edition. After having given a number of counsels to all

1 editions: P. G., II, 1793-1884. H. Van de Sande Bakhuyzen, *Der Adamantius*, Leipzig, 1901. Studies: O. Bardenheuer, *Urch. d. K.*, π, 248-255. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, I (1st ed.), p. 424-427. *Revue de l'histoire ecclésiastique*, XXIV, 8.

2 Edition: F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderm. 1906. Studies: F. Nau, *Didascalie*, in *Did. thol.*, col. 734-748. 3 X Funk, *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1902, article on the *Date de la Didascalie*, I (Paris), *La Didascalie* (thesis), Langres, 1906.

Christians and especially to married people (ch. 1-3), it deals in particular with duties of the *hierarchy*, beginning with the *bishop* (4-12), who is the key-stone supporting the other members, and who has absolute authority in teaching, sacraments and temporal things; it then deals with the *lower hierarchy* (13-20), which comprises the priests, deacons, widows and deaconesses, and also perhaps the lector and the subdeacon (the latter is mentioned once). The *Iasi chapters* (21-27) treat of fasting (22) and various doctrinal questions: the resurrection of the dead, relations with the heretics and the connection between the Law and the Gospel.

This work, imitated from the Didache, is really original, although the author drew upon various sources; but it is entirely destitute of literary worth. It is, however, extremely valuable as regards the history of ecclesiastical discipline. The author, who appears to have been the bishop of some country town in North Syria, probably wrote during the second part of the third century, if we can judge by his reference to recent persecutions and his opposition to rigorism, probably that of the Novatianists.

II. WESTERN ANONYMOUS WRITINGS.

Only the better known writings, which have been attributed to Saint Cyprian, will be mentioned here.

Several of these have already been dealt with:

1. The *De spectaculis* and the *De bono pudicitiae*, which are preferably to be ascribed to Novatian (see ch. VI, p. 253).
2. The *Ad Novatianum*, written about 253; a violent refutation of Novatian (see ch. VI, p. 254).
3. The *De rebaptismate*, a vigorous pamphlet defending the Roman ruling against Saint Cyprian (see ch. VII, p. 261).

In addition to these may be mentioned:

1. The *De aleatoribus* was attributed to Pope Victor I by Harnack, who considered it the oldest Latin Christian writing. In reality it is based on Saint Cyprian's works. It is written in the form of a sermon, poor enough from a literary standpoint, but extremely eloquent in its condemnation of games of chance. It must be attributed to some bishop and even more probably to a Pope, since the author, "having

¹ Editions: P. L., 4, and G. Hartel, *Corpus* of Vienna. Studies: Sil O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, II, 440-453. P. Godet, art. *Cyprien* (*Saints in Did. thiol.*, col. 2464-2466).

² *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, v, 1, Leipzig, 1888. See Harnack's argument and the criticism of A. d'Alès, in *Etudes*, 1905, t. 104, p. 291-317. See also the critical study in the *Séminaire d'Hist. litte.*, Louvain, 1891.

in raised to the seat of the Vicar of Christ", derives "his authority from the Apostles on whom Christ founded His Church"'.¹

De Pascha computus, written for Easter 243, is an attempt to correct the calculation of Hippolytus.

De laude martyrii², a feeble enough discourse, both as regards the matter and the style.

The other writings attributed to Saint Cyprian are less well known, or the date from a later period (4th or 5th cent.).

III. THE ACTS OF THE MARTYRS³.

The name of Acts of the Martyrs is given to those early writings which tell of the last moments of the confessors of the faith. They were intended to serve both as a record and as instruments of edification for the faithful. It was usual to read them to the community on the martyr's anniversary. Since these writings were sent from one Church to another, they soon took the form of collections. Before the persecution of 303, Eusebius had already made a very complete collection of all the authentic writings dealing with the martyrs of the first three centuries. This work is unfortunately no longer extant; only a few unimportant fragments remain. We still possess, however, an account of "The martyrs of Palestine during the present persecution (303-311)," composed by Eusebius. These official proceedings have usually come down to us preceded by a little introduction and terminated by a conclusion which gave them a more human or supernatural touch.

For a better appreciation of the documents which deal with the first martyrs, it is necessary to class them under three classes: a) The Acts properly so called (*acta, gesta*) are official documents, consisting of reports drawn up by the clerks of the *notarii* (notaries). They relate the appearance of the martyrs before the court, their interrogation and their condemnation. These minutes were kept in the archives, but the Christians could occasionally obtain a copy by arrangement with subordinate officials.

¹ Ilop. 1. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, II, 447.

² Monceaux, *Hist. litt. Afr. chr.*, n, 97-102. — 3 *Ibid.*, 102-106.

³ Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta*, Paris, 1689; supplement by Le Biant, *Les Actes des martyrs*, Paris, 1883. Knopf, *Ausgewählte*

alien, Tübingen, 1901; Gebhardt, (same title), Berlin, 1902.

⁴ KRCQ, *Les Martyrs*, I-III, Paris, 1902-1904; and *Les Actes des Martyrs*, I, *Arch. lit.*, I, 1903, col. 373-446. A. Dufourcq, *Etude sur les Gesta*

biens romains, Paris, 1900-1907; and *Actes des Martyrs*, in *Diet. Hist.* T. i. 1910, col. 396-408. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, II, supplementary

lib. i. p. 611-641. — s See below, p. 324.

b) A number of descriptions of the martyrdoms have also been composed both by eye-witnesses and by contemporaries; these are entitled *passiones*, *martyria*. They are quite as valuable as the public documents, particularly those which consist of official communications between the Churches.

c) Lastly, we have the accounts of the martyrdom. These are far more numerous than the last mentioned and were composed long after the events they relate. Their historical value depends on the sources used by their authors. In some cases they are of considerable worth, but for the most part the writer has done no more than embellish a traditional theme as his fancy dictated.

Unlike the latter, the first two classes of Acts possess unquestioned authority, and are really important both for apologetical and historical study. Truth speaks on every page of these documents. The judges and the martyrs appear as they really were; the former apply the law, notwithstanding it is true against their will, but driven on nevertheless by their sense of duty; the latter accept their sentences with simple courage and die fearlessly for their faith. About forty of this kind of document are extant on the martyrs of the first centuries. Some of them are only preserved in later recensions, which, however, reproduce a part of the original Acts.

The chief of these official papers now extant are:

1. The *Acts of Saint Justin and his companions* (d. 163-167).
2. The *Acts of the martyrs of Scillium*, Africa (17 July 180). These are certainly contemporary documents, and probably the original minutes of the proceedings.
3. The proconsular *Acts of Saint Cyprian* (14 Sept. 258).

The earliest eye-witness or contemporary accounts are:

1. The *Martyrdom of Saint Polycarp* (written in 155-157).
2. The *Acts of Saint Carpus, Papytus, Agathonice* (d. 161-162), ■
3. The letter of the Church of Lyons and Vienne on the Martyr of 177 (written in 177-178)*
4. The *Acts of Apollonius* (d. 180-185).

5. The passion of *Saints Perpetua and Felicitas* (d. 7. March the earliest and longest recension, ascribed by some to Tertullian, dating from about 303. The visions and the charismata mentioned in this Martyrdom are no proof that the saints were Montanists, although the work shows a slight leaning to the doctrine of the Phrygians.

* See O. Bardbnewer, *op. cit.*, p. 615-641. — See above, p. 74.

3 These may have been composed by Saint Irenaeus. See F. Viuig Jrtmle (Saint), in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 2405. See above, p. 144.

BOOK II

The century of the great Fathers of the Church

(Second period: From 300 to 430)

INTRODUCTION.

I. GENERAL OUTLINE. DIVISION AND CHARACTER OF FOURTH CENTURY PATRISTIC LITERATURE.

The period which stretches from Saint Athanasius to the death of Saint Augustine is rightly considered the golden age of early ecclesiastical literature. Never before had the Church possessed such fertile or so talented writers: never before had they produced such a spate of works of genius, as this period is, it was more especially during its later years, from 361 to 430, that the greatest authors flourished, and the more brilliant works were written.

There exist very good reasons for dividing the 130 years, which may be conveniently termed the fourth century, into two parts. They saw the inception of the great Arian and Nicene controversies, which were to be followed by interminable disputes on Christology. During the first part, before 361, Arianism, although condemned at Nicaea, is far from vanquished and even seems to triumph for a time, but its downfall is brought about by the unremitting efforts of *Loz/ Athanasius* in the East and *-Saint Hilary* in the West. This victory, however, is not complete until the second part of the period (361-430). Then it is that the *Nicene Fathers* arise in the East, Saint Basil, Saint Basilior Nazianzenus, Saint Gregory of Nyssa and *Saint Chrysostomus*, the famous representative of the School of Antioch. In the West there are *Saint Jerome*, the Doctor of the Holy Scriptures, *Saint Ambrose*, the Doctor of the independence of the Church, and *Saint Augustine*, not only

Doctor of Grace but also Doctor universal; he it was who raised Latin theology to such heights that it definitely broke away from the East, and from Origen in particular. From that time forward he was to be the chief, and perhaps tin-only, source of Christian theology in the West. Around each of these great doctors cluster a group of lesser authors.

The most outstanding features of the patristic writings of this period would appear to be as follows:

1. The great authors were careful, both when writing and when speaking, to present Christian truths in *classical* form. Having been brought up in the classical tradition, they also urged the younger Christians to study the ancients and perfect their style.

2. The *vigour of their ideas* was derived from their firm and far-seeing faith and constant recourse to their deep philosophical culture. The latter did not prevent the Fathers from perceiving the relative value of the teaching of the early philosophers and Christian doctrine.

3. The *universal extent* of the subjects which they treated. They wrote on everything and nearly always successfully: exegesis, apologetics, controversy, dogmatic and moral theology, asceticism, even poetry, and above all eloquence which at that time had many admirable exponents.

The causes which gave rise to such progress in all branches of ecclesiastical learning were many and various. The chief of these were:

1. The conversion of the *educated classes* within the Empire provided the Church with eminent scholars, men of letters, and exacted a higher standard of culture from those who were to be the pastors of this new class of Christians.

2. The *greater measure of peace* enjoyed by the Christians after the conversions of the Emperors; the more talented among them were thus enabled to give more time to study and undertake the composition of lengthy works.

3. The importance of the questions which were disputed in those controversies arising out of what have been called the *great heresies*.

4. Lastly, the development of *monastic* life. Solitude, silence and prayer came to the help of mere scholarship giving to it greater depth and solidity. Many of the Doctors of this period led a mortified and ascetic life.

II. THE SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT.

A). The Church and the State. The mark which really sets this period apart from the one that precedes it is the reconciliation of the Church and the State. The Church was declared free by the Edict of Milan (313) and was given, first by Constantine and then by his successors, an ever increasing number of privileges until it finally became the State religion under Theodosius. The reign of Julian the Apostate was no more than a momentary arrestation of the slow evolution which brought Christianity to this favoured position¹.

1. Considerable advantages were derived from the religious policy of the Christian Emperors:

i. *Paganism*, thus deprived of its chief support, rapidly lost way in cities, while the Christian missionaries were no longer hindered in country districts, where the old worship still retained its vitality.

The *clergy*, having been accorded a number of civic privileges, were able to develop rapidly and soon constituted a kind of independent body unhindered in the peaceful pursuit of its ministry.

The *higher hierarchy*, forming the various ecclesiastical provinces, were also strengthened by the civic rights it received, which in most instances were proportional to the political importance of the city.

Ecclesiastical councils, greater than any previously held, were invoked more frequently, and were thus able to invest their decisions with more solemnity and authority.

These advantages, however, were not without their drawbacks.

The best known is *Cesaropapism*: this is the name given to the fusion of the civil power to deal with questions of a religious nature; to be "Pope" and "Caesar" at the same time. No doubt in Constantine's thought of himself only as the "lay bishop" (τὸν ἐκτὸς ... in cene'), but several of his actions, towards the end of his life, in favour of Arians, prove that he took this attribution too much in earnest. According to Saint Athanasius², his son, Constantius, invaded the "holy city" for the space of ten years (351-361) he was the embodiment of what was bad in Caesaropapism, and found many to imitate him in this.

1. P. Allard, *Le christianisme et l'empire romain de Néron à Théodose*, pp. 155-289.

2. Eusebius, *Vita Const.*, iv, 23. Whatever may have been the original meaning of this famous expression which Constantine pronounced at a banquet, it is usually interpreted as "a clever assertion of the Church's liberty in her own country." Liberty which Constantine was determined not to infringe" (P. Batiffol, *Le christianisme constantinien*, p. 353).

3. *Life of Julian*, T. I.

4. J. G. G. Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium, I, (Paris, 1926),

5. *Life of Julian*, T. I, p. 54.

2. The State's invasion of religion was perhaps less perilous than the servility engendered in the ranks of the higher clergy, an exaggerated *subservience* to court caprice, especially in the East. This "liberalism", as it may be called, was of the greatest service to the Arians, and postponed the triumph of the Nicean profession of faith until the end of the century. Without such obsequiousness on the part of the clergy, Caesarianism would never have existed nor would it have been the source of such disorder.

3. An even more serious *doctrinal liberalism* would have been the outcome of the conduct of the Arian episcopacy had not Athanasius in the East, and Ambrose in the West appealed to tradition and loudly affirmed the independence of the Church.

B). The breaking-up of the Empire which went on during the fourth century could not but aggravate these unfortunate tendencies, the inevitable result of the close bond which united Church and State. Diocletian's action in dividing the Empire into two parts, the *East* and the *West*, had serious consequences. Constantine's restoration of the monarchy in 323, after the defeat of Licinius, did not stop the movement. After his death, the Empire was again divided and the religious policy of Constantius II did not apply the brake; far from bringing the various peoples to a closer understanding, it widened the breaches, even from a religious aspect, which separated the East and the West. Theodosius established unity in the Empire only for a very brief period, and after him the separation became irrevocable. The barbarian invasions certainly contributed, but the existing administrative division corresponded to very real political aspirations.

This state of affairs is really important, for out of it arose a serious menace to the Church. Among many members of the episcopate, and especially in the East, there existed an ingrained tendency in the fourth century to think of the Church in terms of the State. This episcopate, it is true, was Arian, but it created a state of mind which was not sufficiently combated when the doctrinal errors were rejected. The sense of Christian unity, which until that time had really benefited by the unity of the Empire, was blunted by it.

* The first great treatises *De Ecclesia* were not composed until the sixth century. We cannot expect to find, therefore, a very precise and detailed thing in the early Doctors, who had not studied this subject as closely as moderns. The essential features may nevertheless be found in the writing of Western Fathers who had to deal with Donatism. Even the Eastern Fathers, although taken up with other problems, managed to write a good deal about it when dealing with the question.

division. This was aggravated by the fact that the Eastern branch bathed in the reflected glory of the first Christian Emperor. The esteem and veneration in which Constantine was rightly held was embodied in his town of Constantinople.

C). The Christian generations which produced the great doctors were remarkable for the firmness of their faith. Some of those Christians, however, who following the example set by the princes had been received into the Church without sufficient instruction, retained traces of *Pagan customs*. The Fathers were energetic in repressing these latter. Saint John Chrysostomus was the most celebrated in this connection and died a martyr in the pursuit of this work. The Graeco-Roman society in the fourth century was extremely well educated both in *letters* and philosophy, and was eager to *understand* its faith. Such *curiosity*, excellent if kept within the right limits, can easily degenerate should it be transformed into mere rationalism. Both the perils and the advantages of this intellectual curiosity will be better understood by a study of the many *heresies* which appeared about this time, and the great doctrinal *movements* which reduced even the most orthodox.

III. THE HERESIES IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

I. No more than a summary outline of the heresies will be given here. The more important will be dealt with in later chapters, while the others may be studied in special works and in general histories.

I. In the fourth century, there existed at least ten kinds of heretics. The first five (A) are concerned with the *Trinity* or *Trinitology*; the second five (B) have each a different object.

I. The Arians, or followers of Arius, denied the *divinity of the Word* and in consequence the Trinity also. At one blow they destroyed the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Redemption (see p. 309 sq.).

The Pneumatomachi denied the *divinity of the Holy Ghost*, and withdrew from the Trinity. Their error was a development of Arianism; and indeed they are classed with the Arians or Semi-Arians. They have also been called *Macedonians*, *Marathonians*, or *Tropicians*. (See p. 318).

I. The Sabellians, or followers of Sabellius, averred that the Divine Word were not realities, but merely *modalities*, diverse manifestations of the same Person, Who is God. Hence the name *Modalists*. They were also called *Phoninians*, because their teaching, together with *Monism*, was defended by Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, a disciple

of Marcellus of Ancyra, and like him a protagonist of the *ὁμοούσιον* (see P. 33°).

4. The Apollinarists, followers of Apollinarius, in an attempt to render the doctrine of Christ's divinity more certain, taught that Christ's *humanity* was incomplete, consisting of no more than a body and an inferior or sensitive soul. The Word took the place of the spiritual soul (see p. 448).

5. The Nestorians denied the *personal unity of Christ*. They distinguished in Him two separate Persons, God and Man, and thus denied the *God-Man*. Nestorianism did not come to a head until 430, but it was already in germ in the *Christological dualism* taught by the School of Antioch (see p. 459).

B). 6. The Origenists, followers of Origen, in the *proper sense* of the word, defended the latter's eschatological errors and especially the temporal nature of the pains of Hell (see p. 213, 219-20).

The *prudent Origenism* practised by the School of Alexandria, which favoured a spiritual exegesis with a mystical leaning, must not be confused with these errors.

7. The Manichaeans believed in two eternal and irreducible principles, *Good* and *Evil*. They professed to find in this teaching a perfect explanation of all natural and supernatural mysteries (see p. 276).

8. The Donatists, led by Donatus of Carthage, the founder of the sect, affirmed that even on this earth only the *saints* and the *just* members of the *visible Church*, and made the *validity of the Sacrament* depend on the personal holiness of the minister (see p. 390).

9. The Pelagians, followers of Pelagius, taught that *human life* was *all-powerful in the moral order* as regards the doing of good and the avoidance of evil. They denied the need, and even the existence, of interior grace which moves the will (see p. 391).

10. The Priscillianists propagated a doctrine which was a continuation of Sabellianism, Manichaeism and various Origenist theories (see p. 606).

IV. DOCTRINAL MOVEMENTS.

THE SCHOOLS OF ALEXANDRIA AND ANTIOCH.

The heresies mentioned above are those which deny the fundamental truths of Christianity. Faced with this subversive teaching and in their struggles with it, the Fathers followed each his own particular way of exposing the great truths of faith. Such diverse yet orthodox movements are to be found especially in the East. Two of the most outstanding of these were those that characterised the *School of Alexandria* and the *School of Antioch*, besides the teaching of the *Traditional School*.

1 The pseudo-mysticism of the Euchites had nothing in common with Origenism.

A) The School of Alexandria.

1. The *first School of Alexandria*¹ had known two generations of men of great but unequal genius; the founders were Clement and Origen; their successors, Dionysius, Theognostes and Pierius, continued the work they had begun. The New School flourished throughout the fourth century. In Egypt it had for its representatives Saint Athanasius and Didymus the Blind, who remained faithful to Origen's principles while tempering their application; they were followed at the end of the century by the *Cappadocians*, who were the most brilliant and most learned of Origen's disciples.

2. The spiritual exegesis of the Alexandrians has already been sufficiently dealt with². Other features which give individuality to the School are as follows:

3. Four main tendencies may be perceived at work in the School.

a) The *mysticism* of the Alexandrians is well known; it formed the essence of their exegetical method. By "mysticism" we mean their inclination to rise to the contemplation of God, in Himself, in His word as contained in the Scriptures, and in His works. This contemplative movement was destined to have a favourable influence on their theology³.

b) *Platonic Philosophy*, dealing as it does with the conception of divine ideas, and everything else in the light of these ideas, helped them greatly in their work.

c) In *theology*, their firm faith in the *divinity of the Word* led them to a clear affirmation of His *substantial sameness* with the Father. Their sense of Tradition had caused them to follow those passages in Origen in which he affirms the divinity of the Son, in spite of the fact that these passages are less prominent than those in which he appears to subordinate Him to the Father. They confidently accepted the *ousia* defined at Nicaea, which became their favourite position. In this manner the *unity of God* obtained first

¹ See above p. 172, 179, 187, 201 sq.

² See above p. 206-209.

³ This movement must certainly be called *mystical*, for it implies that these knowledge is aided by that superior light which God vouchsafes only to pure and humble souls. See the General Introduction p. 28-30, and the chapters dealing with the School of Alexandria, p. 184 sq., and Origen, p. 211.

place in their thoughts. They stressed this aspect of their theology at the risk of being accused of Sabellianism.

d) Their *Christology* showed the same tendency to insist on the *divine aspect* of Christ; His divine nature, and to identify all His Divine Person, leaving His humanity somewhat in the shade, much as in their exegesis they hardly stopped at the letter before rising immediately to the *spirit*, the divine element in the Scriptures. The Alexandrians became till defenders of the *substantial and personal unity of Christ*; in the following century this doctrine was so energetically affirmed by Saint Cyril that Monophysitism, although it travestied his real doctrine, based its own teaching on his affirmations.

B) The School of Antioch I.

1. It is usual to distinguish three periods in the history of the School of Antioch :

a) The *beginnings*, stretching from 260 to 360, comprising the early inception of the School, due to the influence of its priests, Lucianus and Dorotheus 2, and also its development in the fourth century by the first disciples of Lucian, among whom are to be found many recruits to Arian subordinationism.

U) A *period of especial brilliance* which produced extremely illustrious masters, although there were some whose teaching was not above suspicion : Flavianus, Diodorus of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and above all Saint John Chrysostomus.

c) Lastly, a *period of decadence* after 430, resulting from the bad reputation into which Nestorianism had caused the methods and teaching of the School to fall.

2. It differed from the School of Alexandria chiefly in its exegesis. As an offset to the misuse of allegorism, it enounced the principle "that every passage of Holy Scripture possessed a *literal sense*, either proper or metaphorical. The true sense of scriptural metaphor and of the parables found by means of an attentive consideration of the specific

1 See L. PIROT, *L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de Mopsueste*, Rome, I (Introduction: *L'Ecole exégétique d'Antioche*, p. 1-41). — "See above p. 3K11

• Among these may be mentioned Arius himself, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Arius of Cappadocia. The case of Eustathius of Antioch is more complicated. See p. 300.

features of Hebrew and Greek literature, by a careful comparison of similar passages in the Bible, and by a grammatical and historical explanation. Besides the literal sense, both proper and metaphorical, the existence of a typical sense was affirmed, also based on the literal sense and destined to 'express the relations existing between the two Testaments'. In practice the following rules were observed :

λ) Only one literal sense is to be attributed to each passage of the Bible.

A) This sense is the first to be determined.

c) It can never be useless, contradictory, or unworthy of God.

d) Lastly, it is the basis of the typical sense, should such exist.

This method was prudent and well calculated to moderate the imaginary excursions favoured by the Alexandrian method. These principles, which are now generally accepted, were unfortunately exaggerated by some of the masters of the School of Antioch and they fell into the pit they had dug for themselves. "Constantly preoccupied with studying the Holy Bible as grammarians and historians, many came to regard it as no more than a purely secular writing and became deaf to its divine messages." By giving too much importance to the *letter* they neglected the *spirit*, the divine element in the Scriptures. They had intended to correct an abuse, but as often happens in such cases they fell into the contrary excess.

Other tendencies, legitimate in themselves, helped to re-entrench this danger at Antioch.

a) For the mysticism of the Alexandrians, the School of Antioch substituted a *moral teaching* which, handled by Saint John Chrysostom, produced irreproachable masterpieces, but which, in the works of a Theodore of Mopsuestia, favours strongly of Pelagianism.

(/) *Aristotelian philosophy* which was chiefly cultivated at Antioch induced, on the one hand, an extremely precise, positive and analytical research method, but, on the other hand, lacked inspiration and inclined to that species of rationalism which so easily blunts the sense of tradition.

c) In its *theology* the School of Antioch clearly stated the distinction of the *Divine Persons*, as it is affirmed in the Scriptures. The better to ensure the reality of this distinction it gave them the name of *hypostases* (ὑπόστασι substance) at the risk of giving a more or less explicit impression that they are not only a substance but that they also differ from one another by the substance. It was for this reason that so many members of the School opposed the term *δμοούσιος* of Nicaea. In this they were also influenced by the misuse which Paul of Samosata had made of this word at Antioch in the preceding century. It is also possible that they found this distinction of three hypostases more satisfactory since the divine unity was apparently maintained by a more or less radical subordinationism based on certain passages from Origen.

d) Lastly, the School of Antioch readily stresses the *humanity* of the Saviour in its *Christology*, just as it insisted on the letter of the Scriptures, to the extent of seeming to neglect the substantial bond which links the human to the divine nature in the personal unity of the Incarnate Word. This inclination to distinguish the *man* from the *God* in Christ was destined to lead to the negation of the *Man-God*, even before Nestorius.

C) Traditionalist School

In the fourth century may be found not only the masters of these two great schools, but also a number of writers who are regarded as representative of a *School* almost exclusively *traditionalist* in its teaching. The better known at the beginning of the century are *Saint Methodius of Olympus* and at the end *Saint Epiphanius*. If his work only is considered, *Saint Cyril of Jerusalem* may also be included. Why should not the same be said of *Saint Eustathius of Antioch*? There is no reason for supposing that he suffered from the influence of Lucianus. Such a hypothesis offers a better explanation of his energetic opposition to Arius as well as in Origen, and also of the undying hatred to which he subjected '.

* O. Bardenhever, *Patr.*, it, p. 5. — ' See above p. 285-286.

3 In this connection may be mentioned P. E. Bouvier's theory of a double theological tradition at Antioch, which would explain the length of the schism following from the deposition of Eustathius. See the *Revue Augustinienne*, (VI), p. 171.

V. DOCTRINAL PROGRESS IN THE IVth CENTURY.

A) Dogma.

Solemn definitions on three fundamental points rendered dogma more explicit in the fourth century.

I. At the Council of Nicaea (325) the Son was declared In be God and consubstantial (ὁμοούσιον) to the Father. Although this expression is not found in the Scriptures, it was nevertheless legitimate, useful and even necessary to dissipate the misunderstandings which had arisen on this point.

In the Council of 381, approved later by Rome, and in the Creed of Nicaea-Constantinople, the *Holy Ghost* was also proclaimed to be God: *Dominum et vivificantem, ex Patre factum edentem, cum Patre et Filio adorandum* ¹.

Lastly, the doctrine of the existence of *original sin* and the necessity of *interior grace* was defined by Pope Innocent I and Pope Zosimus when they condemned the Pelagians. His condemnation was simply renewed in the Council of Ephesus in 431 ².

I. Nearly all the *great doctors* had their part in these developments by their firm resistance to heresy. The preciseness and unambiguity in the definitions were sometimes couched in quite new expressions, the *ὁμοούσιον* for instance. As a justification of this progress, the Fathers appealed to an oral tradition, as distinct from the Scriptures, handed down to their forefathers ³. All the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, affirmed the authority of this tradition to which they appealed, although they were not yet able to indicate clearly in what it essentially consisted. The argument drawn from previous doctors by the Fathers did not come to the fore until the middle of the fifth century. Saint Augustine expressly showed that a *Universal custom* can have a demonstrative value when he linked the existence of original sin from the universal usage of infant baptism ⁴. Although oral tradition had not yet been identified with the ordinary magisterium of the Church, the infallibility of the latter was universally reco-

¹ H. S. Zinger-Bannwart, *Ench.*, n. 86, p. 39.

² n. 101-108, p. 47-49. — 3 *Ibid.*, n. 126-127, p. 56-57.

³ Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n. 11-17, 256-257, 260-261.

⁴ *De peccatorum meritis*, I, 16 sq. See also *De baptismo*, IV, 9, 31.

gnised. The organs of infallibility had not been rigorously determined, but the *Apostolic See* was considered as possessing a very special authority.

B) Theology. To this purely dogmatic developments which was the work of all the Fathers, several among them added another of a *theological nature*. It was the outcome of a deep speculative study of the truths of revelation. The most outstanding of these doctor theologians were Saint Basil, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus and Saint Gregory of Nyssa in the *East*; Saint Hilarius and chiefly Saint Augustine in the *West*. No doubt their speculation was aided by *philosophy*. The influence of the latter is especially to be seen in the works of Saint Gregory of Nyssa in the East and Saint Augustine in the West. Nevertheless its importance should not be exaggerated; dogma is enriched and confirmed by philosophy, not by the addition of foreign elements but by a more thorough penetration of its own content. Moreover most of the Fathers were somewhat mistrustful of philosophy in the proper sense of the term; they did not borrow its theses, but rather its precise *terminology* and its *method* of research.

Moral theology was that part of Christian doctrine which had the greatest development in the course of the fourth century. More often than not it found its place in commentaries of the Bible. The better part of the immense work of Saint John Chrysostomus as well as that of Saint Ambrose deals with moral teaching. The latter, indeed, composed a real moral synopsis in his *De officiis ministrorum*. As for Saint Augustine, although his work is in general of a dogmatic nature it nearly always contains a moral aspect in which the great Doctor did not separate from his dogmatic foundation.

Ascetical theology, which is a particular form of moral theology from which it was hardly distinguished by the earlier writers, also knew a considerable development. This is due to: a) The *founders of the monastic life*, whose rules we still possess; chiefly Saint Pachomius and Saint Basil; b) the *masters of Christian monasticism*, who explained its "spiritual" and thus presented a *spiritual teaching* possessing a universal application. Of these, Saint Nilus, Evagrius, Saint John Chrysostomus and the Cappadocians may be mentioned in the East, and Saint Ambrose, Saint Jerome, and especially

Saint Augustine in the West; c) lastly, those who *defended the traditional teaching* against the perversions to which this spirituality was subjected by Origenism, and Pelagianism in particular*. Saint Augustine, by his energetic upholding of the rights of grace, did far more for asceticism than those who unreservedly exalted the power of the will.

VI.—DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE REGARDING THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

A) Outline of the question.

The existence of a *privileged See* in the Church is a necessity, an essential condition of *Christian unity*, and even of simple *Christian life*. Since the Church is a true *society*, the only unity which can be proper to it is a *social unity*, which cannot be attained in the absence of a head, unifying all the members of the organism. Moreover, the Church, constantly brought into contact with human societies which pursue a different *end*, has the duty of maintaining her *independence* under pain of abandoning to a great extent the *milieu* which is the reason for its existence, the perfect Christian life of the faithful. Given the nature of the Church, this may only be achieved through the *moral force* which links each part to the whole, and by the support which the parts find in an *authority* which makes of them an

Among these perversions of moral teaching may also be mentioned the error of the Euchites.

■ The Euchites (according to Epiph., *Hares.*, 80; August., *De tuer.*, 17; Theodor. RKT, *Hist. Eccl.*, iv, 10) were heretics, natives of Syria (district of Latakia), who at the end of the fourth century gradually spread as far as Asia Minor, where they were condemned at Side (390) by a Council presided by Amphilochius of Iconium. The *Asceticum*, a summary of their teaching, was condemned by the Council of Ephesus (431). This work is now lost, but the essential features of their teaching are known to us through the 19 propositions limited to them by Timothy of Constantinople (7th cent.): they are cited in his *De receptione hereticorum* (A. G., 86, 45-47). The most characteristic doctrine of the sect is that of the *personal union* of the devil with sinners, and of the struggle with the just. "God and Satan fight for the possession of the souls." This struggle supposes three stages. In the last, which is marked by the *Ignominia* (apathy) the soul is hypostatically united to the Holy Ghost. This *Ignominia* was completed by a rigid quietism, for the adepts of this heresy believed that all work and trusted in prayer alone to rid them of the devil and unite them to God (hence their name *Euchites*). They were also called Massalians, buying folk, from the Syriac) or dancers. They themselves preferred the name *Ignominia*. After their condemnation, they refused for a considerable period to separate themselves from, and submit to, the Church. See G. Barreille, *Euchites*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1454-1465.

organic whole. This point of view alone, already supposes a See, possessing special powers, especially in those cases where the relations of Church and State are friendly and the danger of the subservience of the former to the latter becomes pre-urgent and more subtle.

Nevertheless, whatever may be the necessity of a supreme See, it cannot be said that such is the true foundation of the Apostolic See. In reality its sole foundation are Christ's words to Peter: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her* (Matth., XVI, 18). *Feed my lambs; feed my sheep* (Joann., XXI, 15-17). Christ willed the existence of this See; it was revealed by Him and is a *dogma* of the faith. The Apostles, inspired by God, and infallible as they were, had not such a great need of this support as their successors who were open in a greater measure to the assaults of the devil. It is especially to these latter, and to the Church which they represent, that Christ gives His help in the person of Peter and those who succeed him as long as the Church shall endure. Thus the existence of an Apostolic See is above all a dogma.

In this dogma, as in all other dogmas, there has been and necessarily took place a certain progress; a gradual unfolding of the truths contained implicitly in the principle. Just as progress has been possible in the comprehension of the words by which Christ revealed the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, so also has it been possible for the proper understanding of these other words of the Saviour: *Thou art Peter; Feed my sheep*, especially as this latter declaration implies an infinite number of applications. It regards not only faith but also works, and must be adapted to the most divergent circumstances. The *needs* arising from these circumstances provoke the required developments, but as is the case with other dogmas its progress was chiefly determined by the opposition which was offered to it. This opposition was especially serious in the fourth century. It had three main sources: a) the *social environment*; b) the *heretics*, the liveliness of controversy and the weakening of Christian feeling which often enough went hand in hand with the latter; c) lastly, the formation of the Eastern Patriarchates. It is necessary to insist on the last mentioned point.

1 See above, p. 293-295.

B). The Patriarchates. From the time of Justinian (6th cent.), the idea that the Church was presided by five *Patriarchs* (*Pentarchy*) was frequently expressed. But this was a new theory, no trace of which is to be found in earlier documents. The idea of three Patriarchs (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch) all occupying the same chair of Peter was cherished even by the Popes, but this does not go back much farther than the Council of Chalcedon'. It was here that Saint Leo protested against the creation of new patriarchates erected by this Council, especially that of Constantinople (to which the Council of Constantinople, 381' had already accorded a dignity of honour in its *third canon*, rejected at Rome). "In reality, neither the system of five patriarchates nor that of three great Apostolic Sees was the expression of an early conception. Before Constantine there was never question of three Sees. At the Council of Nicaea", the rights of the See of Alexandria over the Egyptian episcopate were fairly well defined, while those of the See of Antioch were less clearly stated. The Council in no wise affirms that these two Sees, whether united or not to the Roman See, constituted a regular authority, charged with the religious government either of the whole Church or of those churches contained in the Eastern half of the Roman Empire³". The authority of these two Sees did not really extend beyond the limits of their provincial territory⁴*. Ephesus possessed a similar authority in proconsular Asia. But although this Church had been founded by the Apostles its authority was superseded by the Church of Byzantium-Constantinople, whose bishopric is not earlier than the third century. The growth of Constantinople was favoured by the proximity of the Court, and more especially by the *permanent synod* (σύνδοδος ἐνδημοῦσα), a kind of episcopal Council which dealt with religious business submitted to the Emperor and especially with appeals [from lower courts]. This last patriarchate was created by the Eastern bishops at Chalcedon (451)' and was maintained in the face of Saint Leo's protests.

I. Whatever may have been the motives for these new foundations they were no more than institutions of ecclesiastical origin and of restricted authority when compared with the *Apostolic See*, divinely instituted and possessing *universal* authority, both as regards the power it has received and the place in which it exercises it. Nevertheless the new foundations had the serious defect, not only of obscuring this necessary superiority, but also of ultimately compromising it by the apparent assimilation of new Sees to that of the successor of Peter.

I. Mgr Duchesne (*Eglises séparées*, Paris, 1905, p. 167) was of the opinion that the theory of three Patriarchates deriving from Peter was first conceived at the time of the Council of Chalcedon. Mgr Batiffol proves that the theory is older than that, and was already discussed by Boniface I in 422. *Le Pape et l'Apostolique*, p. 259-265.

II. Canon VI. It was upon this canon that the Popes, after Boniface I, based the exclusive mentioned theory of three patriarchates.

III. Mgr Duchesne, *Ibid.*, p. 169-170.

IV. This authority developed chiefly in the fourth century.

I. Sec S. Vaillhé, *Les origines de l'Eglise de Constantinople*™ *Echos d'Orient*, I (1907), p. 287 sq.

II. Sec S. Vaillhé, *Le droit d'appel en Orient et le synode permanent de Constantinople* in *Echos d'Orient*, t. XX (1921), p. 129 sq. — Canon 28.

And it is a fact that the countries of Greek culture, from Syria to Constantinople in the fourth century, conceived a theory of Church government by means of great and almost autonomous ecclesiastical provinces tending to exclude all interference from Rome in all matters not directly connected with faith.

The immediate results of these new foundations were: 1. constant rivalry between the great Sees, Antioch and Alexandria at first, and afterwards Constantinople; 2. trouble and divisions in the Church, due to the absence of an indisputed superior authority: the complaints which arose out of this disorder are echoed in the works of the Fathers, Saint Basil and Saint Gregory Nazianzen; 3. Imperial interference in ecclesiastical matters; this was aggravated at Constantinople by the intrigues of the Court bishops to which Saint John Chrysostomus fell a victim.

These weaknesses of the system, confirmed as they were by their results in practice, were bound to bring a reaction in their wake, especially after the death of Saint John Chrysostom. The Popes protracted their rights, even in the East, and they were officially recognised, not only in the time of Saint Leo (440-461) whose pontificate marks the zenith of the Apostolic See in the fifth century, but also many years before him. No less than for the other dogmas, there was here a perfectly legitimate development, based on tradition and Christ's words to Peter.

C) The doctrine of the Apostolic See.

1. The bishops of Rome proclaimed themselves the successors of Peter and laid claim to his privileges. This was not only their right but also their duty; had they not done so they would have been guilty of a grave neglect of their office and their silence would have been a serious argument against the reality of their mission. Such an argument has no grounds for existence. The Popes who have most firmly affirmed their title are Julius I 3, Damasus, Siricius 5, Innocent I 6,* Zosimus 7, Boniface I 8. It should be noted that they are alone in their claim to be the successors of Peter, and that the bishops of Antioch, who might have had some apparent

* Due, to a great extent, to the influence of the Arian Canons at Antioch (311 See p. 33S.

2 The development of the patriarchates, on the contrary, was opposed rather than in conformity with, tradition.

* Letter of the year 340 to the Eastern bishops, quoted by Athanasius, *Cont. Arian.*, 32, 35.

4 Letter of the year 377 to the Eastern bishops, against Apollinarius, *fl. Theodoret, Hist. Eccl.*, v, 10.

5 Letter to Himerius of Tarragona (385); Denzinger-Bannwart, *η.* 8; P- 39.

• Letter 29 to the African bishops (417); *ibid.*, n. too, p. 46.

' Letter 12 to the African bishops (418); *ibid.*, n. 109, p. 50.

" Letter 13 to Rufus of Thessalonica (422); *ibid.*, n. no, p. 50.

reasons for claiming this privilege, never attempted to do so. Even those who refused to submit to the Bishop of Rome never rebelled for this reason; their objections were either based on political grounds or else they acted without reference to any principle. As for the *nature of this authority*, although it took on many and various forms, it is certain that it was more than an authority of honour; it was a *real authority*, both as regards *discipline* and *faith*. This is proved by few but nevertheless significant facts.

2. The more important of these facts are: n) with regard to *faith*: 1. The condemnation of Apollinarius by Damasus (.377), by means of a synodal pronouncement, which had been demanded by Saint Basil himself and which was afterwards accepted by the whole of the East (Council of Alexandria, 378; Council of Antioch, 379); 2. the condemnation of Pelagianism by Popes Innocent I and Zosimus; this definite pronouncement was accepted in the East (inscribed in canons i. 4, of the Council of Ephesus). 3) From a *disciplinary* point of view, the appeals to Rome of bishops who had been unjustly deposed; such *appeals* suppose that the Bishop of Rome had the right to *reverse synodal condemnations* in disciplinary matters. They used this right on several occasions, although in some cases the desired effect was not forthcoming. In this connection may be mentioned the victims of the Arians, Saint Athanasius, Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, and later Saint John Chrysostomus. At the Council of Sardica (343) the right of appeal to Rome was discussed, and aroused the opposition of many Eastern bishops, chiefly Arians or those tending to Arianism, who in this way represented tradition. In spite of this opposition, in perhaps on account of it, this Roman privilege gradually became more widely accepted; in the middle of the fifth century it was uncontested.

Besides this historical evidence, many doctrinal affirmations of the Fathers may be found in the fourth century. Some of the more outstanding of these will be quoted in the following pages. But it should be noticed, first of all, that these affirmations are variously expressed. Some are

1. P. Batiffol, *Le Siège Apostolique*, p. 391-619.

2. Nicoll, *Life of Saint Athanasius*.

3. P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique*. See especially the note on *Les droits / l'Église romaine chez Socrate et Sozomène*, p. 411-416.

complete, in the sense that they clearly state the two elements of the teaching which concerns the Apostolic See: *a*) the Primacy of Saint Peter; *b*) the Primacy of the successors of Peter. Others are *incomplete* in the sense that the authors, according to the particular end they have in view, speak only of one or the other of these two points; thus it is that Saint John Chrysostom in his homilies only speaks of the Primacy of Peter; Eusebius, the historian, deals only with the coming of Peter to Rome, where his See is found. Other authors, on the contrary, say nothing at all on the subject, but no argument can be drawn from their silence. Although Saint Hilarius does not speak of the Primacy, he certainly knows of it, since he quotes, in one of his historical fragments,* the passage of a letter of the Council of Sardica to Pope Julius, to whom, says the document, all priests must refer; *ad caput, id est ad Petri Apostoli Sedem*. An author's silence, even when he might have been expected to speak on this subject, proves only that he did not regard this doctrinal point as being as important as it really is; not that he denied it.¹ Explicit denials, whether by word or deed,² are to be found only among the heretics, especially the Arians or those who came under their influence. The witness of traditional faith is not to be found here. The early authors possess the authority which is implied by the title of Father, only when they speak as witnesses of tradition and in agreement with that tradition.

¹ *Fragni, hist.*, II, 9.

* See the observation in note I, p. 284.

² Certain impatient expressions found in some letters have nothing in common with these denials; they are not to be explained by doctrinal reasons but by vastly different causes.

FIRST PART.

THE BEGINNINGS OF THE GREAT PATRISTIC CENTURY.

(From 300 to about 360).

CHAPTER I. Introduction—Arianism '.

I. THE ARIAN CONTROVERSIES.

The fourth century was almost entirely occupied with the Arian controversies. Before any discussion of the Fathers' teaching and the part played by them in these controversies, it is necessary to know something of the representatives of the error which they opposed and to follow the fluctuating developments of the doctrinal struggle which was influenced in a large measure by the attitude taken up by the various emperors. For the sake of clarity four phases may be distinguished:

- i. Under Constantine (d. 337);
Under Constantius II and Constans (337-350);
3. Under Constantius II (350-361);
4. After Constantius II (361-381).

i. Under Constantine (d. 337). Arianism consists essentially in the denial of the *divine nature* of the Word, the Son of God, Christ. It was a little before 320, at Alexandria, that Arius openly proposed his error. It was condemned in 320 by an Alexandrian Council, and in 325 by

1. BIBLIOGRAPHY. Besides the Histories of the Church, the following should be consulted: X. Le Bachelet, *Arianisme* in *Diet, théol.* col. 1779-1863. J. H. Iront, *Hist. Dogm.* n, p. 19-66. P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme* Paris, 1914, p. 307-535. G. Rasnkur, *L'homoioitsiasme dans ses rapports avec l'orthodoxie* in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.* 1903 (iv), p. 189-200. 111431.

the Oecumenical Council of Nicaea in which the Son of God was declared to be *consubstantial* with the Father (ὁμοούσιος). Arius and his chief followers were exiled by Constantine. The leader of the latter, Eusebius of Nicomedia, soon regained the Emperor's favour and was not long in becoming the head of a large group of bishops, especially from Syria and Asia Minor. This group denounced as a Sabellian or Modalist error the ὁμοούσιος which they themselves had accepted at Nicaea. For a certain number of rigid Arians this fear of Modalism was probably no more than a pretext, since in reality they also professed a radical Monarchianism; others, however, such as Eusebius of Caesarea, who had borrowed and aggravated Origen's subordinationism, may have been really sincere. Eusebius of Nicomedia was clever enough to unite all these factions and with their help succeeded in obtaining from Constantine a number of measures against the Fathers of Nicaea: 1. exile of Eustathius of Antioch, 330; 2. rehabilitation of Arius shortly after 330; 3. exile of Saint Athanasius, deposed by the Arian Council of Tyre, 335; 4. exile of Marcellus of Ancyra, deposed by the Arian Council of Constantinople, 336.

B). Under Constantius II and Constans (337-350). While *Constans*, Emperor of the West favoured the Catholics, his brother, *Constantius* (337-361), was soon won over by the Eusebians. The exiles who had returned were obliged to flee; Marcellus in 338, Paul of Constantinople in 339, and in 340 Saint Athanasius, who went to ask the support of Pope Julius I. The Eastern bishops, who also had recourse to the Pope, refused to obey his rulings and held a series of assemblies at *Antioch*, where they evinced a desire for separation.

The most celebrated of these assemblies is that of May-September 341, called the "Concilium in Eneaniis" (of the Dedication), which adopted at least *three professions of faith*¹; the first had no doctrinal importance; the second was chiefly concerned with the condemnation of Sabellianism³; while the third was directed against Marcellus of

¹ Constantine II, Emperor of the West with Constans, died in 340 and the latter added his brother's possessions to his own.

■ Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 22, 23, 24.

³ The second formula is sometimes attributed to Saint Lucian of Antioch,¹ according to Sozomenus (*Hist. Eccl.*, III, 5), but such an attribution is far from being proved. Moreover this formula was the most important of those concocted by the Council, and was used later as a source for many Homoiousian professions of faith. See G. Bardy, *Le Symbole de Lucien d'Antioche et les formules du Synode in Eneaniis*, in *Rech. Sc. relig.*, 1912 (III), 129-155, 230-244.

Ancyra. A fourth formula which is due either to a later Council or to the four bishops whom it sent as delegates to Constans, is a condemnation of Marcellianism and absolute Arianism. In spite of the progress which this movement of moderation made among a great number of Arians, they disassociated themselves from the Council of Sardica (343), and although they were unable to prevent the assembly from reinstating the deposed bishops, they refused to submit to its decisions. Nevertheless the new profession of faith that they drew up at Antioch in 345 is couched in a more conciliatory tone than the others; it is called the *long formula* and is the fifth of Antioch'. The negotiations of the Emperor of the West with Constantine, both before and after •Sardica, assured a certain measure of peace to the East. Saint Athanasius was enabled to return to Alexandria in 346 (21 October).

C) Under Constantius II, who became sole Emperor (350-361) ⁸, the Arians resumed their agitation and endeavoured to impose their faith on the whole Empire by force. Having deposed Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, in the synod of Sirmium (351) which adopted a new profession of faith, called the *first formula of Sirmium* ⁴, they persuaded the Emperor to alienate the West from Athanasius. Constantius set to work at the Councils of Arles (353) and Milan (355) and exiled those who were refractory to his proposals. The Arians then split up openly into three groups, according to their different shades of belief, and each group in its turn gained the favour of Constantius.

The first to obtain his favour and secure recognition of their formula (*the second formula of Sirmium, Iftf*) ³ were the strict Arians, uncompromising doctrinaires, who as absolute Monarchians not only did not admit that the Word was God, but also affirmed that He is *unlike* to Him, ἀνομοιο ; they are called Anomoeans.

They were immediately opposed by the *moderate Arians*, who until then had only been aware of the Sabellian danger. In a synod at Ancyra (358) they proclaimed that the Word is similar in substance (ἰμοιοῦσι) to the Father, and shortly afterwards, in yet another synod at Sirmium, they made a profession of faith based on various earlier documents (2nd symbol of Antioch, 1st formula of Sirmium, etc.). This new formula, which was relatively orthodox, although incomplete and therefore dangerous, has been given the name of *3rd formula of Sirmium*, and was again approved by Constantius. This moderate party, which is to be praised at least for its opposition to Eunomianism, are called Semi-Arians, or Homoiousians.

⁸ Athanasius, *De Synodis*, 25. — ⁶ Athanasius, *ibid.*, 26.

⁷ The short interregnum of the usurper, Magnentius, is passed over.

⁴ Athanasius, *ibid.*, *if*.

³ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁶ Propositions 5, 8, 9, from the 19 adopted at Ancyra (EpU'HANIUS. *Hares.*, 73, 2-11). The 19th, which condemned the ε'μοῦσις, was dropped at Sirmium.

Before long, however, the radical Arians gained first place in the Imperial favour by their presentation of a doctrine more subtle than that of the Anomoeans; they admitted that the Word is *similar* to the Father (ὅμοιο) but they rejected the use of the word οὐσία, and thus incidentally condemned the use of the words ὁμοιούσιο and δμοούσιο .. These Homoeans, who had a political rather than a doctrinal end in view, made their profession of faith at Sirmium in 359; such is the *4th formula of Sirmium*. A number of bishops having added the words, *in all things*, to “similar” (κατὰ πάντα.) thus reasserting the οὐσία, these words were suppressed in a new version concocted shortly after at Niké in Thracia. The Emperor, completely won over by the Homoeans, imposed their creed by violence and fraud on the Western bishops at *Rimini*, and on the Eastern bishops, probably at *Seleucia*, 359, and more certainly at Constantinople, 360. In spite of the reservations made by many of those who signed, and although the formula was not formally heretical, it was a dangerous formula and a formula made to serve the *political* ends of the Arians. It is certain, however, that the Arian faith at no time became the faith of the Church or of the episcopate. Pope Liberius, who had returned to Rome in 358 was excluded from all these negotiations.

D) After Constantius II (361-381). The triumph of the Nicene faith. The reaction in favour of Nicaea took place immediately after the death of Constantius. It made fairly rapid progress *in the West*, where the nomination of Saint Ambrose to the See of Milan marked the end of Arian domination (374). *In the East*, reaction was longer in making itself felt owing to the support which the Emperor Valens gave to the Arians and the troubles in the Church of Antioch. When it came, however, it was as efficacious as in the West. It was initiated by Saint Athanasius in 362, who championed it until his death. The Cappadocians also collaborated usefully by showing that it was possible to render compatible the two expressions: *one nature* (basis of the ὁμοούσιο) and three hypostases. In 378 and 379 the whole of the East subscribed to the doctrinal pronouncements made by Pope Damasus at Rome in 377. The accession of Theodosius decided those who still hesitated. Finally, the adversaries of the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost were condemned

¹ Even the use of the word ὑποστάσι was condemned.

- It is clear in what sense Saint Jerome's outburst should be understood : *Tunc USIÆ nomen abolitum est: tunc nicana fidei damnatio conclamata est. Ingemuit toties orbis et arianum se esse miratus est.* (*Dialog, adv. Luciferianox*, η. 19). And a few lines further on he adds these words, which should follow closely on the foregoing: *nihiljam supererat spei: Dominus excitatur, impera! tempestati^ bestia* (Constantius) *moritur^ tranquillitas rediit.*

² Sponsored by Liberius, and Damasus, Saint Hilarius of Poitiers and Eusebius of Vercelli.

it the *Council of Constantinople*, which, starting as a simple regional Council, soon acquired the authority of an Oecumenical Council¹.

IL ARIUS AND HIS FIRST FOLLOWERS.

A). *Arius* (256-336). I. His Life. Arius, a native of Libya, and a disciple of Lucian of Antioch², together with Eusebius of Nicomedia (whom he calls his "collucianist" in one of his letters), is found in Egypt at the beginning of the fourth century. He was ordained a deacon about 308 and a priest about 310. In 313 he was put in charge of the Baucalis Church at Alexandria. His supple and flexible intellect, his subtle logic, together with his grave and austere demeanour and persuasive eloquence attracted many. These qualities, however, were but a screen to cover up a great deal of pride and hypocrisy. He was intellectually stubborn, and took advantage of his charge at Alexandria to disseminate a new doctrine, deriving in all probability from Paul of Samosata³ through Lucian. The circumstances which gave rise to his quarrel with his Bishop, Saint Alexander⁴, are unknown since the historians give divergent and contradictory accounts of the affair. He was condemned by a Council held at Alexandria, probably in 329. He took refuge, first in Palestine, and then with his friend Eusebius at Nicomedia, where for the purpose of spreading his teaching he composed a work entitled *Thalia* (Θαλία, banquet), a mixture of prose and verse. It was in order to deal with him that the first Oecumenical Council of Nicaea was called (325). Condemned, and exiled to Illyricum, he was rehabilitated after 330 by Constantine, to whom he had presented a somewhat vague profession of faith. Saint Athanasius, however, refused to receive him. After the latter's exile he tried, but still in vain, to return to Alexandria. His followers obtained his admission into the clergy of Constantinople in 336. He was about to make a triumphal entry (336) when he died suddenly in circumstances which moved one author to write again the words: *diffusa sunt viscera eius* 5.

¹ More will be said of the Council in the life of S. Greg. Nazianzus and Greg. of Nyssa. — 3 See above, p. 281-282.

² See above, p. 281-282.

³ See p. 175-176 note concerning Saint Alexander of Alexandria.

S. Athanasius, *Letter to Serapion* (358); P. G. 125, 685-690.

2. Of the writings of Arius the following only are extant: *a)* a few fragments of Thalia, preserved by Saint Athanasius¹; *b)* two letters, one addressed to Eusebius of Nicomedia about 321, and the other to the Bishop of Alexandria shortly before the Council of Nicaea: *f)* his profession of faith addressed to Constantine after 330².

3. These writings in spite of their brevity contain a sufficient indication of his teaching⁴, which may be reduced to the following points:

rt) God is one and not engendered (ἀγέννητο). It is impossible for Him to communicate His substance; everything existing outside God is created *ex nihilo* by God's will.

b') The Word is an intermediary between God and the world, existing before time, but not eternal; *there was a time when the Word was not*: ἦν ποτέ δτε οὐκ ἦν.

e) The Word was therefore *created*: ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων γέγονε. He was made: γενητό. Should it be said that he was born, engendered γεννητό, such an expression must be taken as meaning a sonship of adoption.

ζ) It follows that of His nature the Word is fallible, but His moral righteousness preserved Him from any fall. He is inferior to God, but so perfect a creature that no other may be created superior to Him.

The Arian teaching was fully developed right from the beginning. Although it was attenuated by the Eusebians, the original teaching was resumed by the Anomoeans.

B). Eusebius of Nicomedia⁵ (d. 341 or 342). After having been Bishop of Beryta, he had himself transferred to Nicomedia, the Imperial residence, in order to enjoy the favour of Licinius (before 320). In 339 he had Paul, orthodox Bishop of Constantinople, deposed, and occupied his See until his death. A friend and follower of Arius, he was the centre of all the intrigues which went on at Court for the confusion of the defender of the Nicene faith and the rehabilitation of Arius and his followers, first in the time of Constantine and later under Constantius. In reality, his ideas were quite as advanced as those of Arius himself, but he cast about them such a cloak of ambiguity that he was able to maintain harmony among the adversaries of Nicaea, who, as it later transpired, differed considerably among themselves. It is he who was responsible for the great spread of the Arian controversy, which without him would never have gone farther than Egypt or Alexandria. He composed no works. His was probably a voluminous *correspondence*, but there

¹ *Contra Arianos*, I, 5, 6, 9. *De Synodis*, 15.

² S. Epiphanius, *Haeres.*, 69, n. 6, 7, 8.

³ SOCRATES, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 26; Sozomenus, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 27.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 24-29.

⁵ G. Bareille, *Ensebe de Nicomidie*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 1539-1551.

remains extant only one letter, preserved by Theodoret, addressed to Paulinus of Tyre before the Council of Nicaea, in which he clearly affirms the creation of the Word

Asterius of Cappadocia, sophist and a warm defender of Arianism, is chiefly known for a collection of texts (συνταγμάτων) which he composed to prove that the Word was created and as a refutation of Marcellus of Ancyra'. He also composed a number of commentaries, notably on the Psalms, the Gospels and the Epistle to the Romans³.

HI. CHIEF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ARIAN SECTS.

A). The Anomoeans. The best known writers of this group are *Aëtius*, *Eunomius* and *Eudoxius*. The three Court bishops who worked for the triumph of Arianism in the West, *Germínais* of Sirmium, *Ursacius* of Singidunum (Belgrade) and *Valens* of Mursa in Pa.nnonia, cannot be considered as writers.

1. Aëtius (d. 367), native of Antioch, a deacon about 350, bishop without a See under Julian, was the first to return to pure Arianism after 350, and gathered around him the ardent members of the sect. One of his writings has been preserved by Epiphanius * *On God unengendered and on that which is engendered*. It is but a series of 47 dry arguments to prove that all which is engendered cannot be God. It appears that he had produced 300 similar demonstrations.

2. Eunomius s (d. after 390?), a disciple and secretary of Aëtius, became Bishop of Cyzicus in 360. He resigned shortly afterwards rather than subscribe to the teaching of the Homoeans. First with Aëtius, and more especially after the death of the latter, he was the true leader of the Anomoeans, who also take their name of *Eunomians* from him. His extant works are:

a) the *Apologetical Bbook* written about 361 and refuted by Saint Basil.

lf) the *Apology of the Apology*, refutation of Saint Basil's work (379).

c) a *profession offaith* 7, addressed to Theodosius (383) who rejected it. It contains pure Arian teaching.

¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 5.

• Saint Athanasius quotes and refutes Asterius, chiefly in the *Contra Arianos*, I, 30-34; *De decretis*, 28-31; *De synodis*, 18-20.

¹ See G. B a r d y, *Astirins le sophiste*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1926 (t. 22), p. 221-72. The author deals with his life and writings, cites 36 extant fragments, and gives a synopsis of his theology', the strictest kind of Arianism (p. 267).

¹ S. Epiphanius, *Hares.*, 76, n. it.

• See X. L e B a c i i f . i . e t ., *Eunomius*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 1501-1514. See also by the same author *Attius*, *ibid.*, col. 516-517.

• *I'. G.*, 31, 835-868. — ' *P. G.*, 66, 587 sq., note.

3. Eudoxius* (d. 369), Bishop of Antioch, favoured Aëtius and Eunomius at first, but later went in with the Homoeans, thus obtaining the See of Constantinople which he retained until his death. Under Valens he was the leader of official Arianism. There remain only inconsiderable fragments of his writings'.

B) The Homoeans.

1. Aeacius of Caesarea (d. 366) succeeded Eusebius about 340 and soon showed himself to be an ardent Arian. In 377 or 358 he caused Saint Cyril of Jerusalem to be deposed. At the synods of Seleucia-Constantinople in 359-360 he disassociated himself from the Anomoeans and the Homoi-ousians and remained in high favour while Constantius lived. He continued, like Eusebius, to add to the library of Caesarea. He composed a work against Marcellus of Ancyra and a panegyric of his predecessor. A few fragments of his exegetical works are preserved in the "Catenae". These, together with the quotations in Epiphanius, are all that remain of his writings.

2. Eusebius of Emesa ‡ (d. about 359) comes into this group, although he has little to do with the doctrinal question. He was a native of Syria, educated at Edessa, Antioch and Alexandria. In 341 he was wise enough to refuse the See of Saint Athanasius which was offered him by the Council of Antioch, but he accepted the See of Emesa (341) and kept it until his death. He was brilliantly clever and a fertile writer. Nothing remains either of his *treatises* (Against the Jews, Against the Pagans, Against the Novatians), or of his *Commentaries* (on Genesis and the Epistle to the Galatians), or of his *Homilies* (on the Gospels). Two homilies, however, *De fide adversus Sabellium*, found among the works of Eusebius of Caesarea§, are attributed to him. For no apparent reason his name has been given to 56 homilies *ad populum et monachos*, and 145 or 142 homilies *In Evangelia festosque dies totius anni*.

3. George of Laodicea, a native of Egypt and early follower of Arius, was obliged to take refuge in Syria where he became bishop. He is chiefly known for a biography of Eusebius of Emesa, an outline of

† See M. Jugie, *Eudoxe*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1484-1487. See also by the same author, *ibid.*, *Eudoxiens*, col. 1487-1488.

‡ To Eunomianism, which is radical Monarchianism, may be assimilated the Adoptianist teaching of Photinus of Sirmium who admitted the Nicene *ὁμοούσιο*, but who, like Paul of Samosata, gave it a frankly Unitarian meaning. He was deposed by the moderate Arians in 351, when the Catholics had already separated themselves from him and even condemned him. He claimed to follow the teaching of his master, Marcellus of Ancyra.

§ Epiph. *Hares.*, 72, n. 6-10. Hieron., *De Viris*, 98. SoCR., *Hist. A.*, I, 1.

n, 4-

4 P. Godt, dans *Did. thiol.*, col. 1537-1539. See Hieron., *De Vins*, 91J

* P. G., 24, 1047-1070, and P. G., 86, I, 535-562.

which is given by Socrates'. A treatise written against the Manichaeans no longer extant'.

C) Homoiousians or Semi-Arians.

I. Basil of Ancyra (d. 366)⁸ succeeded Marcellus of Ancyra in 336. It is possible that he may have been banished from his See after the Council of Sardica, but he was back again by 350 and played an important part under Constantine; as important perhaps as that of Eusebius of Nicomedia. At the time of the internal scission of the anti-Nicene group he became the uncontested leader of the moderate Homoiousian group⁴ which discomfited the Anomoeans at the third Council of Sirmium (358). But having been weak enough to accept and attempt to explain the fourth formula of Sirmium, he suffered a set-back from the Homoeans, first at Seleucia (359) and more especially at Constantinople (360). It was then, in an apparent endeavour to cover up his defeat, that he composed a long theological memorandum which developed the teaching of the propositions of Ancyra §,

The attitude which Basil had adopted and his strong opposition to Eunomianism led the defenders of the Nicene faith to think of winning him over to their side. Saint Hilarius criticised his formulas indulgently and approved of them to a great extent. Saint Athanasius took the same line of action in his *De Synodis* and showed himself even more favourable to Basil at the Council of 362. But all this proved in vain. Basil never went farther than the ὁμοούσιον, the similarity of substance. He carried his teaching to its logical conclusion and associated himself with those who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. That opinion which sees in him a representative of the official teaching of the Church on the Trinity, the doctrine which combines the two formulas, *one nature* and *three hypostases*, is erroneous.

I¹ *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 9. Sozomenus quotes one of his letters, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, 13.

I² Epiphanius, *Hares.*, 66, 21.

I³ L. E. Bachellet, *Basile d'Ancyre*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 461-463. G. Rasnitsin, *L'homoiouianisme dans ses rapports avec l'orthodoxie*, in *Rev. Hist. eccl.*, 90 (t. IV), chiefly p. 199-206. J. Schladebach, *Basilius von Ancyra*, Jflpzg, 1898.

⁴ He was the prime mover in the assembly of Ancyra (358) and the 19 doctrinal propositions which were drawn up a little before the Council of Sirmium were in large measure due to him. See above, p. 311.

⁵ Epiphanius, *Hares.*, 73, 12-22. See in particular G. Rasneur's study Ili's writing.

Basil never admitted the first term. In addition to tin-
above mentioned *memorandum* the Bishop of Ancyra com-
posed a no longer extant treatise against Marcellus and a
treatise *De Virginitate* L

2. Eustathius of Sebaste² (300-380?), a Cappadocian and a man of
great austerity, was one of the first founders of monastic life in Asia
Minor. His disciples exaggerated their asceticism, much as the early
Encratites had done, and were condemned by the Council of Gangra
about the middle of the fourth century (probably in 350). These rigo-
rous measures do not seem to have affected Eustathius, since he is found
occupying the See of Sebaste about 356. It was at this time that Basil,
future Bishop of Caesarea, returning from Athens also established
monasticism in Cappadocia. In the Arian controversy, Eustathius first
sided with the Homoiousians, but in 360 subscribed to the Homocan
formulas. Later, in the reign of Valens, having been sent to Rome by
his party in order to negotiate with the Western group, he signed
a formula containing the $\delta\mu\omicron\omicron\theta\sigma\iota\omicron$ submitted to him by Pope Liberius.
On his return he became for some time a friend of Saint Basil, but
afterwards left him, slandered him and went back to Semi-Arianism.
In reality he was a fluctuating, weak-willed man, whom the Protestants
have tried in vain to whitewash. None of his writings are extant³.

3. Macedonius (d. 362) was one of the leaders of the
Semi-Arians and usurped the See of Constantinople from
342 to 346 and from 351 to 360. The heretics who denied
the divinity of the Holy Ghost are named after him. It is
scarcely probable, however, says Tixeront⁴, that he perso-
nally taught the *doctrine of the Pneumatomachi*. Maratho-
nius, Bishop of Nicomedia, on the contrary, was one of the
prime movers in this heresy.

D). Arian historians. To the above mentioned authors, who for-
mulated the theory of Arianism, may be added the names of two histo-
rians, Sabinus and Philostorgius, whose writings are more or less colour-
red by Arianism.

i. *Sabinus*, Bishop of Heraclea, was a Semi-Arian and composed
a history of the Councils from that of Nicaea to the time of Valens.
This work, which was used by Socrates, is no longer extant.

¹ F. Cavallera discovered this treatise in the form of the *De vera virginitate* published as a work of St. Basil (*Dubia et Spuria*, P. G., 30, 669-800). See *Bev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1905 (t. V), p. 5-14.

² S. Savaïille, *Eustathe de Sibaste*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1565-1571. See P. Allard, *Saint Basile*, p. 123-128. F. Loops, *Eustathius von S.*, Halli., 1898.

³ Sozomenus wrongly attributes to him a *Liber Asceticus* of S. Basil (*Hist. Eccl.*, in, XIV, 31); only the letters 361-364 of S. Basil's correspondence [*Spuria-Dubia*] and the *Letter to Apollinarius on the divine essence* can be attributed to him.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 58.

⁵ See P. Batiffol, in *Byzant. Zeitschrift*, 1898.

2. *Philostorgius*, a fifth century Anomoean, is the author of an Ecclesiastical History in 12 books covering the period from the beginning of Arianism until 425. Several long fragments are extant

CHAPTER II.

Eusebius of Caesarea.

Special Bibliography.

i. Editions: *P. G.*, 19-24. Recent critical edition in the *Corpus of Berlin*, Leipzig, 1901-1913 (the greater part of his historical and theological writings).

2. Studies: F. J. STEIN, *Eusebius, Bischof von Caesarea* (life, writings, doctrine), Wurtemberg, 1859. V. HELY, *Eusibe de Cesarie, premier historien de VEglise*, Paris, 1877. J. B. Lightfoot, in *Did. of Christian Biography*, II, 308-348. See also P. BATIFFOL, *La paix « nstantinienne et le catholicisme*, ch. vi-vii. C. VERSCHAFFEL, *Eusbe « Césarée in Diet, théol.*, col. 1527-1532 (Bibliog. 1530-1532).

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER OF EUSEBIUS.

A). Life. Eusebius was born about 265, in Palestine, probably at Caesarea, where he was brought up by the priest, Ilorotheus. Called to the priesthood by the Bishop Agapius, he continued his studies under the direction of the erudite Pamphilus, head of the School of Caesarea. These two became joined in a close friendship founded on their mutual admiration for Origen and their ardent desire for knowledge. His greatest ambition was to enrich the library at Caesarea with new manuscripts; and it was probably about this time that he began to find in it the treasures he was to transmit to later generations. The "Acts of the Early Martyrs" was in first writing. During the persecution of Diocletian-Galerius (303-311) Pamphilus was imprisoned; Eusebius refused to be separated from him and they spent their captivity in Ilmposing the famous "Apology for Origen". After the death of Pamphilus, who suffered martyrdom in 309, his faithful disciple wrote his life in three books which Saint

Edited by J. Bidez in the *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1913. Study by P. Batiffol, *Questiones Philostorgianae* Paris, 1891. See also *Roemische Literaturgeschichte*, ix, 1895.

Jerome was pleased to term “*libros elegantissimos*” The veneration in which Eusebius held his master moved him to take his name and he would sign himself as Ευσέβιο Παμφίλου. Having fled to Tyre and then to Egypt, he was finally arrested. He escaped death without compromising his faith. When the Edict of pacification of Galerius appeared in 311, Eusebius again took up the pen to refute the accusations which Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, had made against the Christians, and about the same time he put the finishing touches to the first eight books of his *Ecclesiastical History*.

Named Bishop of Caesarea very shortly after the peace of Constantine (313), he did not let the administration of his diocese interfere with his studies. While continuing his great “*Ecclesiastical History*”, he also composed two new apologetical treatises, one against the Pagans, “*Praeparatio Evangelica*”, and another against the Jews, “*Demonstratio Evangelica*”. His theology unfortunately was not very sound, and when the Arian controversies opened about 320 he went to the side of Arius. It is also possible that a superficial study of Origen’s teaching had given him this bias.

At the Council of Nicaea he was one of the most active of the bishops. He was opposed to the *δμοούσιο* which was defended by Osius together with the majority of the Council. He said that this term favoured Sabellianism. Nevertheless, in spite of the testimony of Philostorgius, he does not seem to have been fully in agreement with Eusebius of Nicomedia. He appears to have been the leader of a third party with leanings to Subordinationism. The creed proposed by the Bishop of Nicomedia was rejected by the Fathers. It may be asked if it was the symbol of Eusebius which was then discussed and completed by the addition of the *δμοούσιο*. This is averred by Eusebius himself in the letter to the Church, but this assertion is open to doubt. Philostorgius, who was an Arian, and Saint Athanasius, who was present, say that Osius drew up this document, and it is generally recognised by impartial critics² that it has Roman characteristics. It could hardly have been pleasing to Eusebius since it contained the word “*consubstantial*”, current in Rome, but an object of suspicion in the East. But illo

¹ See P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme*, p. 328-3id
Mgr Duchesne is of the same opinion, *Hist. anc. Egi.*, II, p. 154.

² Harnack (*Dogmengesch.*, II, 233), Loofs (*Leitfaden des Dogm.*, 241-241)]

Emperor was exacting, and he subscribed to it in spite of his repugnance. On his return he explained his attitude and his doctrine in a letter to his Church.

Eusebius did not honour his signature for long and soon joined the adversaries of Nicaea. He took part in the synods which successively condemned the chief defenders of the Council, Saint Eustathius of Antioch, Saint Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra. At the request of the Arian Council of 336, which deposed the latter, he even composed a double refutation of Marcellus. Constantine held him in great esteem and asked him to write his *Life* as a defence against the Pagan accusations resulting from his conversion.

The special character of this work, which is more of a panegyric than a history, is thus explained by the purpose for which it was intended; it was not finished until after the Emperor's death. In 335, after having been present at the "brigandage of Tyre" which condemned Athanasius (and which is narrated by Eusebius without mention of Athanasius!), he assisted at the dedication of the Constantinian basilica of the *Anastasis* at Jerusalem². Here he preached a solemn discourse which shortly afterwards he repeated at Constantinople at the *tricennalia* of the Emperor. He died in 339 or 340, and was succeeded by *Acacius*, who was destined to become leader of one of the most advanced Arian factions.

B). Character. Eusebius had an *all-embracing mind*. In his works he touched on History, Geography, Exegesis, Apologetics, Theology and even Eloquence. Unlike Origen, master, he was exclusively an erudite. Endowed with a searching mind and an untiring capacity for work, he had read nearly everything contained in sacred and profane literature and made notes on everything that passed through his hands. This is what made him an excellent historian. The great and real value of his scriptural and apologetical works is also due to his immense erudition.

From a doctrinal point of view he is outstanding only in his fight against the Sabellian teaching attributed to Mar-

¹ The expression is Mgr Batiffol's, *op. cit.*, p. 387.

² (On this occasion the Arians held a new Council, aping that of Nicaea, and attempted to exact the rehabilitation of Arius from the Alexandrians. Both Eusebius of Caesarea and Eusebius of Nicomedia must have been present. Alexandria ■■■ Arius and the Emperor did not insist. P. Batiffol, *ibid.*, p. 389-390,

cellus of Ancyra. On the great question of the ἀμωύσιω , which, at that time, was the greatest doctrinal issue, he was unable to take up a definite stand for he was ever prejudiced by' the misuses that Paul of Samosata had made of this term, and this obsession always prevented him from conforming to orthodoxy. His not very precise teaching should probably be reduced to a kind of vague subordinationism, deriving to some extent from Origen. In reality, Eusebius had very *little originality*; his learning was more extensive than it was deep. His sombre, monotonous *style* would seem to bear out this judgment.

Eusebius has been reproached with undue servility to Constantine, but in this he is perhaps judged too harshly. That he had a great admiration and esteem for Constantine there is no doubt, but this can scarcely be put down as a fault, since these were sentiments that were shared by all the Christians of this period, who having suffered first from the persecutions of Diocletian and Galerius and then from that on Licinius in the East, possessed a lively sense of what they owed to the great Emperor. On the other hand, it must be admitted that there is too much flattery in the *Life*, and that Eusebius profited by the imperial favour to obtain a better See than that of Caesarea. It has been remarked that he showed a very evident *vanity* as regards his literal works', but this can be pardoned in one who seems to have spent his life in writing.

A graver defect is his excessive tolerance. It led him, either because of his too great love for peace, or because of his lack of love for the whole truth, to make a number of doctrinal concessions. It may be concluded with Bardenhewer that: "*in the absence of a strength of mind and steadfastness of conscience in proportion to his vast erudition*" Eusebius, in spite of the fertility of his pen and the remarkable value of some of his works, is regarded diffidently and mistrustfully by posterity."

II. THE WORKS OF EUSEBIUS.

These works may be classed under four heads: I. Historical works. 2. Scriptural works. 3. Apologetical and theological writings. 4. Sermons and letters.

A) Historical Works.

I. The Ecclesiastical History is by far the most important; no other work of Eusebius is cited so extensively. It consists of ten books, composed at the following dates:

' See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 387-389.

* *Patrologie*, t. II, p. 20.

3 P. G., 20, 45-906. See also text, translation and notes by E. Gratin, in coll. *Textes et Documents*, 1905-1913.

books I-VIII before 312; book IX, 315; book X, 317; and a revision of the whole work about 324.

The work opens with a short history of Christ (book I). The author then begins the history of the Church from the time of the Apostles to the war of Judaea (bk. II) and from the time of Nero to Decius (bks. in, IV, V, vi); a considerable part of book vi deals with Origen. Eusebius then narrates the sufferings of the Church from the end of the third century (bk. VII), and the beginning of the fourth, until the Edict of Galerius in 311 (bk. viii). Then come the victories of Constantine over Maxentius, and Licinius over Maximinus (bk. ix), and lastly Constantine's defeat of Licinius, 323 (bk. x).

This work of Eusebius is of *inestimable worth*, for without it the history of the first three centuries of the Church would be almost unknown to us. Its chief merit lies in the fact that it is drawn from *reliable sources*, sources which in very many cases are quoted by the author. Together with a mass of facts of all kinds, it contains a variety of documents, official papers drawn from the State Archives and summaries and extracts from many authors. Moreover the author's *sincerity* can hardly be called in question, although his misplaced sympathies sometimes led him to make certain omissions. His *critical faculty* is really astonishing for a man of his time and protected him from accepting a mass of apocryphal and doubtful writings which he was careful to distinguish. Nevertheless his work is not without its *defects*. He has been reproached with faulty composition, for he often deals with the same subject in different places instead of confining it to one; his treatment of the canon of the New Testament is an example of this. The great number of *extracts* makes the work appear more of a collection than a history, and some of these extracts are too short to be comprehensible. Lastly, Eusebius has too little Latin to be really well informed on *Western affairs*. These trifling defects, however, are nothing compared with the greatness of the work as a whole; a work « Inch has earned for its author the title of the "Christian Herodotus" and "Father of Ecclesiastical History

The Chronicle², once greatly esteemed, has now lost li great deal of its interest. The real title is the *Universal History* (Παντοδαπή ιστορία) and therein the author again likes up and finishes a work which had already been Attempted by Julius Africanus³.

* Chapter 4 contains Eusebius' somewhat vague theological ideas on the divinity Christ. — ² P. G., 19, 101-598. — ³ See above p. 280.

The work consists of two parts: the *Chronography*, or summary of the history of each nation, according to the Bible, or the documents proper to each country: the *Canon of the Times* is a synchronised version of all these special histories until the year 325 (which indicates that Eusebius brought his work to an end about this date). Only fragments of the original Greek text remain; the first part, however, is preserved in an Armenian version, while the second part is extant in the Latin version of *Saint Jerome* who completed it by the addition of important historical facts from 325 until the succession of Theodosius (379).

3. The *Life of Constantine* ¹, in five books, written (about 335-340) for the purpose of justifying the Emperor against the Pagans, deals with Constantine solely from the point of view of his relations with Christianity and only insists on his virtues and praiseworthy deeds. Here the author is too partial and disfigures the real nature of events, while his praises of Constantine are far too flattering. Nevertheless, apart from the author's biased judgments, a quantity of really valuable information may be gleaned from these pages, which, however, should be compared with and completed from other sources. It is not absolutely certain that the 16 documents contained in the work are authentic.

4. Other historical works.

a) *On the Martyrs of Palestine* (from 303 to 313). Two versions of this valuable relation, both composed by Eusebius, are extant: the first and briefer version is to be found in the *Ecclesiastical History* (after book viii or at the end) and the other, of greater length, in Syriac ³.

b) *Acts of the Ancient Martyrdoms*, a valuable work, now lost save for a few fragments ⁴.

c) *Life of Pamphilus*, in three books written about 310, is also lost except for short quotations ⁵.

B) Scriptural works.

i. Eusebius has left a book on Biblical Geography, the *Onomasticon*, in which he deals with the names of places mentioned in Holy Scripture; these are classed in alphabetical order, with a short description and a list of names the place has borne at various times. This little work, which was translated and completed by Saint Jerome, was intended to become a part of a complete topography of Palestine and Jerusalem. In the preface of the *Onomasticon* are mentioned three other writings of Eusebius, now lost, dealing with Palestinian ethnography and geography: a) the *names of the peoples* mentioned in the Bible, especially in Genesis (x-xi); b) *Ancient Palestine* and its division among the twelve tribes; c) a *plan of Jerusalem* and the Temple.

¹ P. G., 20, 905-1316. For bk. v see below, *Sermons*, p. 327.

² P. G., 20, 1457-1520.

³ Published by Cureton, London, 1860. See J. Viteau's thesis, *De Eusebii duplici opusculo...*, Paris, 1893.

⁴ P. G., 20, 1519-1536.

⁵ P. G., 10, 1533-1550.

⁶ E. Klostermann, in *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, 1904.

⁷ P. L., 23, 859-928. The additions are of little importance; F. Cavallari, *Sainti firilime*, I, p. 145, note 2.

2. Exegetical works. I. Commentary on the Psalms¹ extant as far as Psalm 118), translated by Eusebius of Veli; 2. commentary on *Isaias*,* in 10 or 15 books, mostly extant; 3. lastly, a commentary on *Saint Luke*, of which fragments still remain. This exegetical work is not without value, although Eusebius is never really master of his subject. His dependence on Origen made him introduce a great deal of allegorism, yet his natural instincts as a historian were better suited to literal exegesis. He attempted to ally the two methods, but with little success.

3. Various treatises on Biblical subjects possess a very real interest:

a) The *Canons of the Gospels* are a kind of synopsis of the Gospels in ten tables, in which the Gospel narratives are arranged in parallel columns showing what is common to all the Gospels and what is proper to each. This work has often served as a source of later Biblical harmonies.

b) *On the Discrepancies of the Gospels* in which Eusebius solves the apparent difficulties to be found in the Gospels, relating to Our Lord's childhood, passion and resurrection. Saint Augustine was to treat the same question, but with greater ease and power, in his "*De consensu evangelistarum*".

c) There also remain fragments of a short work *On Polygamy*, and the unity of the Patriarchs; and another *On the Paschal Festival*, dedicated to Constantine in 332, and arising out of the Paschal question at Nicaea. The only passage still extant is often quoted for its precious witness to the Eucharist and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

C) Apologetical and theological writings.

I. The *Praeparatio Evangelica* 7, was a kind of Introduction to the study of Christianity, showing the superiority of the Jewish and Christian religion over Paganism from its doctrinal, moral and even chronological point of view.

The *Demonstratio Evangelica* 8, proves to the Jews the truth of Christianity by showing that its way was prepared by the Mosaic religion. These two works containing respectively 15 and 20 books were composed from 315 to 325.

II. The *Theophania* or *Divine Manifestation*, written after 323, perhaps about 333, is a summary in 5 books of the *Demonstratio*. It is extant in a Syriac version¹.

¹ I. G., 23, 65-1396; 24, 9-76 (fragments on the last Psalms).

² I. G., 24, 89-528. — 3 P. G., 24, 529-606. — 4 P. G., 22, 1275-1292.

³ I. G., 22, 879-1016 (fragments). — * P. G., 24, 693-706. — A. G., 21, 21-1408.

⁴ I. G., 22, 13-792 (only the first ten books are extant).

⁵ Killion Lek, London, 1842. (Greek fragments, A. G., 24, 609-690)»

4. *General elementary Introduction*, of which only books VI-IX are extant under the title of *Prophetical Extracts* ".

5. The Book against Hierocles³ is a vigorous and biting refutation of Hierocles, Governor of Bithynia under Galerius about 307, who had used Philostratus' life of Apollonius of Tyana to institute a comparison of Our Lord and Apollonius, in favour of the latter. This treatise dates probably from 311-313.

6. Several *other apologetical writings* are no longer extant. These are:

-) Against Porphyry (in 25 books);
-) The Praeparatio Ecclesiastica and the Demonstratio Ecclesiastica ;
- c) Two books of Objections and Defence.

7. Eusebius' *strictly theological* work may be reduced to the two treatises which he wrote at the request of the Ariat synod of Constantinople (335-336) to refute Marcellus of Ancyra, who had just been deposed. The *Contra Marcellum* ³ and the *De Ecclesiastica theologia* ⁺ contain a clear and definite rejection of Sabellianism, which was wrongly attributed to Marcellus. Much less precise, however, is Eusebius' explanation of his own teaching.

D) Sermons and Letters.

1. The 14 Latin homilies³, published by Sirmond under his name, were not all due to him, for the two first at least should probably be attributed to Eusebius of Emesa.

2. Three special Orationes are also extant: one given at Tyre (314 or 315) for the dedication of a church ⁶; another at Constantinople (335)! for the *tricennalia* of the Emperor ⁷; and an oration on the martyrs (extant in Syriac)⁸, probably preached at Antioch. The fifth book of the "Lil. of Constantine", which consists of an "Oration of Constantine to the Church of God", is attributed by some to Eusebius ⁹.

3. Eusebius' correspondence, which must certainly have been voluminous, has all disappeared except the three following letters to:

- a) Carpius: serves as introduction to *Canons of the Gospels*;
- b') Flaccilus; introduction to the treatise *De Ecclesiastics theologia*;

¹ P. G., 22, 1021-1262.— ¹ P. G., 22, 795-868.

• P. G., 24, 707-824. — * P. G., 24, 823-1046.

¹ P. G., 24, 1047-1208.

• Found in the *Hist. Eccl.*, X, 4; A. G., 20, 849-880.

⁷ P. G., 20, 1315-1440.

⁹ Edited and translated into English by W. Wright, 1864.

• It consists of 26 chapters, P. G., 20, 1233-1316.

c) To the Church of Caesarea after the Council of Caesarea. Eusebius explains what part he took in the Council and states that it was he who prepared the symbol accepted by the Fathers¹. As for the term *ὑποούσιον* which was added, he explains that it signifies that the Word was engendered from the substance of the Father (*ἐκ τῆ οὐσίας*) and is similar to Him *in all things*². This shuffling explanation shows that in reality Eusebius really adhered to what came to be called *Homoeousianism*.

Several letters are only known by quotations, notably one addressed to Constantia, Constantine's sister, concerning an image of Christ. This letter was criticised at a later date during the Iconoclast controversies³. Eusebius refused to send to the princess the image she had requested and thus upheld a principle which condemned all veneration of images⁴. It is well known that at the beginning of the century, in 305 or 306, the Council of Elvira in Spain had rejected such veneration. Eusebius represents a similar tendency in the East. Eusebius' doctrinal authority, never very considerable, is not increased by this document.

CHAPTER III.

Chief defenders of the Nicene Faith.

Bibliography : see each author in particular.

I. IN THE EAST.

The most illustrious defenders of the faith of Nicaea in the East were, together with Athanasius (studied in the following chapter), Saint Alexander of Alexandria, Saint Eustathius of Antioch and Marcellus of Ancyra.

A). Saint Alexander of Alexandria (312-328) was the first adversary of Arius, whom he condemned, first in the

¹ See above, *Life of Eusebius*.

² See Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, n. 1. Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 8.

³ Naively by Saint Nicephorus, *Antirrhetica*, in Pitra, *Sfidi. Solesm.*, I, 36. — 4 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, in, p. 444-445.

G., 18, 547-607. Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, IV, 199-200: 433-434. See Tixeront, *op. cit.*, n, 29-31.

synod of 320, and later in two precious and still extant Epistles: *Epistola Encyclica* 1, and *Epistola ad Alexandrum Constantinopolitanum* 2* which was probably an encyclical also. The second Epistle, which is the longer, contains a thorough refutation of Arianism. The bishop gives an extremely forceful explanation of the true faith: the Word is not created, He is eternal and He is God; He is inferior to the Father only in that He is engendered; He derives His being from the very being of the Father (ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ζῆντο; Πατρὸς). It will be seen that this expression implicitly contains the ὁμοούσιο. A collection of Saint Alexander's homilies is lost, save for a few fragments in Syriac.

B). Saint Eustathius of Antioch 3, a native of Side in Pamphilia, was first of all Bishop of Beroea in Syria (Aleppo) and then of Antioch from 324 to 330. He was one of the most energetic opponents of the rising Arian heresy. In all likelihood it was he who pronounced the opening speech before Constantine at Nicaea, and directed the business of the Council. After the Council he took strong measures against the Arians in his own diocese and throughout the whole of Syria. As a result of this, he was the first to fall a victim to the Eusebians, who attacked his teaching and slandered his conduct, finally having him deposed at a synod held at Antioch (329 or 330). Not content with this they also accused him of subversive political activities, and Constantine exiled him to Trajanopolis in Thracia, where he died soon afterwards.

I. Sozomen⁴ tells us that Eustathius was remarkable both for his doctrine and his literary style, but his works, which were many, are lost. Only a few fragments of his *exegetical works* (on the Hexaemeron⁵, on the Psalms, on the Proverbs) remain.

The text purporting to be the discourse⁶ addressed to Constantine at the Council of Nicaea is apocryphal. Similarly, the theological terminology indicates that the Christological homily entitled *In Lanaiouli Mariam et Martham* is a fifth century work⁷. His letters, of which

* Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, 1-6. Text in C. Kirch, *Enchiridion*, p. 216-225, Q Théodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, t. 3.

• Editions: P. G., 18, 613-794. Pitra, *Anal. Sacra*, 11, iv. F. Cavallera, *Sancti Eustathii: Homilia Christologica*, Paris, 1905. Studies: S. Salaville, *Eustathe d'Antioche (Saint)* in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1554-1565, F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche* (4th-5th cent.), Paris, 1905.

⁴ *Hist. Eccl.*, 1, 2; ii, 19.

⁵ A kind of chronicle; P. G., 18, 707-794 (doubtful authenticity).

• P. G., 18, 673-676.

⁷ L. Salter, in *Pul. liti, eccl.*, 1906.

many were still extant in Saint Jerome's time, are all lost, as also is almost the whole of the *De anima*, mentioned by the same author

The greatest of Eustathius' treatises appears to have been written *against the Arians*; it contained at least eight books, now all lost save for a few fragments. The only extant treatise is that entitled *On the Witch of Endor*, against Origen. The author first maintains that it was not Samuel who appeared to Saul, and then, taking a more general stand, he definitely rejects the allegorical exegesis of Alexandria². His preference for the literal sense of the Scriptures makes of him a forerunner of the great Doctors of Antioch at the end of the century. He can therefore be regarded as belonging to their school unless he is considered as a simple echo of tradition. Neither the accusation of Sabellianism, or the many others that were brought against him, has ever been proved; his anti-Arian theology was thoroughly orthodox.

2. After Eustathius' deposition, a part of the Church of Antioch remained faithful to him and formed what is known as the Eustathian party (Catholic). Antioch was governed by Arian bishops until 360. Meletius was then elected. Until then the latter had been connected with the Homoiousians and had been named bishop by the Homoeans; soon, however, he subscribed to the Nicene faith (363). The strict Arians had already nominated another bishop (360) so that the town was divided into three camps: the Eustathians, the Arians and the Meletians. The latter gradually gained more followers while Arianism lost in proportion. Meletius was followed by *Flavian* (381), who was finally recognised by Rome. In spite of this the *Eustathians* continued to resist. One of their priests, *Paulinus*, who had been consecrated by Lucifer of Cagliari (362), was recognised by Rome, as also was his successor, Evagrius (388-393?). Flavian was not approved at Rome until 398. But the greater number of Eustathians did not submit to Flavian's successor until 416 or 417, and it was only at the end of the fifth century, when the remains of Saint Eustathius were transferred to Antioch, that all opposition ceased

The schism of Antioch really began on the day that Lucifer consecrated Paulinus (362). Its real cause, no doubt, was the prejudices of the Eustathians with regard to Meletius' doctrine, who, although not a declared Arian, had been closely connected with that sect. An additional cause was the irregularity of Paulinus' nomination, which was uncatholic and therefore not admitted by most of the Antio-

[¹] *stant infinitae epistolae.* Hieron., *De viris ill.*, 85.

[²] Eustathius thus reveals the *incoherence* of the Origenist method, or at least the use to which it was put, since he shows that Origen treated the narration of the Creation and the work of the first six days as a fable, while on the other hand he takes in a literal sense the calling up of the spirit of Samuel by the Witch of Endor.

[³] J. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche* (4th-5th cent.), Paris, 1905. See also S. Salaville, *Eustathiens d'Antioche*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1574-1576, and J. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 95-97.

chiane'. The situation was aggravated when Saint Athanasius and then Saint Liberius recognised Paulinus, and had a *serious outcome* towards the end of the fourth century. Although the Church of Antioch had no religious authority comparable to that of Rome, it was greatly considered in Syria and Asia Minor. The natural consequence of this was that the *Nicene faith could not prevail* until communion with the Apostolic See was obtained. Nevertheless, Meletius, although he was not in communion with Rome, succeeded in having a formulary of faith, which had been sent to the East by Pope Damasus after a Roman Council in 377, accepted by 153 bishops at Antioch. Graver still were the consequences as regards the *unity of the Church*. On account of the misunderstandings which were at the root of the Schism, a great deal of animosity resulted between the East and Rome, of which traces are found even in Saint Basil's letters². Saint John Chrysostom played an important part in Flavian's reconciliation to the Roman Church³.

C). Marcellus of Ancyra^{*}, Bishop of that town at the beginning of the fourth century was a staunch upholder of Nicaea, and earned the hatred of the Eusebians chiefly by his refutation of Asterius of Cappadocia. His work, of which the proper title is unknown, treated the subject *De subjectione Domini*, and was a rejection of strict subordinatilisim. The Arians employed their usual tactics and accused Marcellin[»] of leanings towards Sabellian modalism and adoptianism: this was the work of Eusebius of Caesarea. It must be admitted that his ideas are obscure and some of his theories disastrous⁵; but at first the orthodox gave them a charitable interpretation. Having been deposed by the Arian Council of Constantinople (336), he was defended by Pope Julius I, to whom he presented an orthodox profession of faith in 440, and also by the Council of Sardica. Saint Athanasius stood by him until he was thoroughly discredited by the errors of his disciple, *Photinus*. Saint Hilarius and Saint Basil abandoned him. It is possible that he returned to his diocese from 344 to 350. He died in 374 or 376, after having written various apologies of his teaching, as well as a number of professions of faith, all of which are lost, save that addressed to Pope Julius I in 340

^{*} F. Cavallera insists more particularly on the second cause, while L. SATTET (*Bull. lit. eccl.*, 1906), together with most historians, lays more stress on the first. — ² See below p. 442. — ³ See below p. 466.

⁴ Texts preserved (126 quotations) in the *Corpus* of Berlin, *Eusebius Hieronymus* (1906), p. 185-215. Study: T. Zahn, *Marcellus von Ancyra*, Göttingen, 1816 (Rationalist). See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 38-41.

⁵ God is one and indivisible; hence He is one *πρόσωπον* and not three *ὑποστάσεις*. The Word was in God from all eternity, but He was not the Son *ἐκ τῆς* all eternity; He became the Son by the Incarnation. It may be wondered will the Son was a Person from all eternity according to Marcellus.

⁶ Εὐριπιδ., *Haeres.*, γζ.

II. IN THE WEST.

Those authors who remained perfectly orthodox in the fight with Arianism will be dealt with in the first place; then those, who, like Lucifer of Cagliari, strayed to some extent from the right path, and lastly Pope Liberius.

A), i. Hosius of Cordova (256-357), Bishop of Cordova from 296, has earned the name of *the Athanasius of the West*. It is probable that he presided at the Council of Nicaea and the Council of Sardica, since his name always heads the list of signatures. All his life, by word and deed, he was one of the chief defenders of the Council of the West. In 354 or 355¹ when almost a hundred years old, he wrote a temperate but courageous letter to Constantius*. His adhesion to the second formula of Sirmium (Anomoean) must be looked upon as a passing weakness due to his great age, his poor health and his failing powers. He wrote very little. Besides his letter to Constantius (354) there is extant a Collection of Sentences edited by Pitra 2 (1888). Two writings mentioned by Isidore are lost.

2. Saint Eusebius of Vereelli, Bishop of that town in 340, was exiled after the Council of Milan to various parts of the East (Palestine, Cappadocia, Egypt) until the reign of Julian (361). On his return to his diocese he continued his onslaughts on Arianism. He died about 370 midis honoured as a martyr³. Three of his letters only are extant⁴. His translation of Eusebius of Caesarea's commentary on the Psalms is lost.

Marius Victorinuss, born in Africa about 300, a greatly esteemed mator in Rome, was converted about 355 and composed various works⁶ on religious subjects, a) Saint Jerome says of his treatises against Arianism (*Adversus Arium libri IV, De generatione divini Verbi, De hanoousio recipiendid*) that they are very obscure and can only be understood by the learned⁷: the author used the Neo-platonician philosophy to refute Arianism. c) His *commentaries* on the Epistles (*Gal., Philip., Ephesi*) were easier, but according to Saint Jerome⁸ they proved

* ATHAN., *Hist. ar.*, 44. — Pitra, *Ana. saera.*, I, 117 sq.

¹ Feast on the 16th December.

i) *P. L.*, 12, 947-954; and *P. L.*, 10, 713-714.

l. ² Works in *P. L.*, 8, 999-1308. Studies: P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. de P. Afrique chrétienne*, III, Paris, 1905, p. 373 sq.

Saint Augustine's first introduction to Neo-Platonism was in the translations of Victorinus (*Confess.* l. VIII, c. it), and later the account of the latter's conversion told to him by Simplicianus was a powerful help in his own return to God (n. 3, 4, 5).

De viris illas. IOI.

I. *In Cal.*, praef.

that "the learned orator can never have studied theology", He also composed two treatises against the Manichaeans and three *hymns* on the Trinity

4. Saint Zeno Bishop of Verona from 362 to 380(?), was as remarkable for his charity as for his opposition to Paganism and Arianism in particular. We have evidence of the latter in what remains of *III. sermons*, 93 fragments, of which 16, which run to a certain length, are really valuable from a literary and doctrinal point of view, especially as regards the Trinity and the Blessed Virgin. The style reveals the author's African origin.

5. Phoebadius, Bishop of Agen, composed in 357 or 358 an energetic criticism of the second formula of Sirmium entitled *Liber contra Arianos*. Two other writings which have been attributed to him would seem to be due to another author. He died after 392. In his "Contra Arianos" he drew largely on Tertullian and also Saint Hilary, then in exile.

B). i. Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370 or 371) was a man of little culture and of a violent and eccentric temperament. His style is colloquial and full of vulgarisms. After the failure of the Council of Arles (353) he was sent to Constantius, together with Eusebius of Vercelli, in order to obtain another Council. In 355 he was numbered among the bishops who resisted the Emperor at Milan and were banished: he passed six months in the East. It was after this that he came to Antioch where he had the unfortunate idea of consecrating Paulinus, the leader of the Eustathians. Had he not taken this step, the Eustathians would have submitted to Meletius, the new Catholic bishop. About this time, between 355 and 361, he composed a number of writings inveighing against the Emperor: *De non conveniendo cunctis heereticis*; *De Regibus apostaticis*; *Pro sancto Athanasio*; *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*; *Moriendum pro Christi Filio*. These are still extant. His violent nature led him to break off many friendships: after the Synod of Alexandria (362), which reconciled Meletius of Antioch and the repentant Arians, he broke away from Athanasius and the whole Church. Many followed his example and formed a sect, but these Luciferians had disappeared by the end of the fourth century.

1 See divers apocryphal writings in *Zl. L., loc. cit.*

- *P. L.*, II, 253-528. See A. Bigeimair, *Zeno von Verona*, Münster (Westphalia), 1904. Also P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. Afr. chrét.*, in, p. 365-371.

1 *P. L.* 20, 13-30.

4 *P. L.*, 13, 767-1049. *Corpus* of Vienna, t. XIV, 1886. Studies: G. K. GER, *Lieder, Bischof von Calaris, und das schisma der Luciferianer*, Münster 1886. E. Amann, *Lucifer de Cagliari*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1032-1044.

2. Among the writers of this sect may be mentioned:

a) Hilarius of Rome, a deacon who wrote short treatises on the necessity of re-baptising heretics (Arians)

ç) Faustinus³, priest, composed in 380 a confession of faith (*Fides Theodosio Imperatori oblata*) exculpating himself of Sabellianism, and a treatise, *De Trinitate*, against the Arians. Later, in collaboration with the priest Marcellinus, he composed a petition to the Emperors in favour of the persecuted Luciferians (Libellus precum ad Imperatores).

c) Gregory of Elvira (d. 392) was the most eminent of the Luciferians; he wrote a considerable number of books, and recent critical research attributes to him the following:

1. *De fide orthodoxa contra arianos*³, which had been ascribed to Ithobadus;

2. *Tractatus Origenis de libris ss. Scripturarum*⁴ (20 homilies);

3. *Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles* sy

4. *Tractatus de Arca Noë*⁶.

His work as a whole indicates a fertile and original writer⁷.

C) Liberius, Pope from 352 to 366, left but few writings; enough, however, to give rise to serious problems which must at least be indicated here. The works usually attributed to him are: a) a *sermon* preached in 353 on the occasion of the taking of the veil by Marcellina, Saint Ambrose's sister⁸; b) the *dialogue* with Constantius after the Council of Milan, 355; a brave protest against the Emperor's exactions⁹; c) especially his *letters*, 13 in all, including the four of which the authenticity is so much in question and which are so important as regards what is usually termed "the fall of Liberius". Accordingly as these letters are regarded as authentic or not, the Pope's attitude and character appear vastly different. Before touching on this subject it would be as well to indicate the points on which historians are almost agreed.

i. It is generally admitted a) that at the *beginning of his pontificate* Liberius showed himself to be a firm defender

³ IliERON., *Altercatio Luciferiani et orthodoxi*, 26-27.

⁴ F. L., 13, 37-107. — ⁵ See Dom G. Morin, *Rev. Bénédict.*, 1902, 225-245.

⁶ Edited by P. Batiffol. See Dom G. Morin's study, *Rev. hist. litt. relig.*, 1900, 190.

⁷ Edited by Heine, 1848. See Dom Wilmart's study, *Bull. litt. eccl.*, 1906.

⁸ Dom Wilmart, in *Rev. Bénédict.*, 1909, p. 1-12.

⁹ F. LejAV, *Dhéritage de Grégoire d'Elvire*, in *Rev. Bénédict.*, 1908, p. 435-457.

¹⁰ Found in Saint Ambrose's treatise *De Virginibus*, in, 1-3. P. L., 16, 219-220, or P. L., 8, 1345-1350.

¹¹ Preserved in Théodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 13, etc... See P. Batiffol, *La fin à constantiniende et le catholicisme*, p. 473-481.

of Athanasius and the Nicene faith against Constantius' Arian policy, and he was banished to Thracia for two years for this reason (from 355 or 356 to 358); *b*) that together with Saint Hilary he upheld, in 358, the newly formulated opposition to Anomoeanism, and that he supported the Homoiousians by conditionally accepting their symbol; Saint Athanasius also, about 360, approved this conciliatory attitude; *c*) that after his return to Rome (358) Liberius remained inactive during the last years of Constantius' reign, but was fairly energetic when the Nicene faith came into its own after the Emperor's death.

2. The Pope's behaviour during his exile and especially in 357, remains obscure. It may be asked whether, during this period, he did not explicitly favour Anomoeanism and subscribe to its formulas. This matter forms the subject of the four letters contained in fragments iv and VI of Saint Hilary's *Opus historicum* 2.

In the letter *Studens paci*, written in 357 (and not in 352, whatever may appear to the contrary), the Pope declares to the Eastern bishop that since Athanasius had refused to appear in Rome when called upon to do so, he (the Pope) was decided to enter into communion with the Eastern bishops and all the bishops of the Catholic Church, and to abandon the communion of Athanasius (Frag. iv).

The letter *Pro deifico* (Frag. vi, 5-7) explains why the Pope delayed his separation from Athanasius for so long; he says that he accepts the faith of Sirmium³ as Catholic, and requests that his banishment be brought to an end. The subsequent signatures found in Saint Hilary's fragments prove with certainty that the first formula of Sirmium is in question.

The letter *Quia scio vos* (*ibid.*, 8-9) is a request addressed to the Comenian Bishops, Ursacius and Valens.

Lastly, the letter *Non doceo* (*ibid.*, 10-u) is a letter sent by the Pope to the old legate, Vincent of Capua, who had gone over to heresy at Arles, telling him of his change of mind and asking him to address a petition to the Emperor.

What is to be thought of these letters? First, there is no question of Papal Infallibility. Even should the letters be authentic, it is certain that the formula signed by Liberius was not the heretical second formula of Sirmium, but the first (351) which was only ambiguous. The question is purely historical; it is nevertheless extremely important, for it regulates the support given by the Apostolic See to the defenders of the faith in those difficult times.

¹ According to SOZOMEN, he expressly condemned "those who did not derive the Son similar to the Father in essence and in all things

See chap. v, Saint Hilary, *Works*, p. 358.

³ The anathemas found in the text are not due to Hilary but probably to a later copyist.

Various Catholic critics admit that Liberius failed in his duty in 367. Such are Mgr Duchesne¹, Father Feder, S. J.², and E. Amann³. In spite of various undoubted interpolations and the fragmentary nature of the work which contains them, they do not doubt the authenticity of these documents, which, they aver, are confirmed by other contemporary writings⁴. The question is not completely solved, however, and those who believe that the *letters are not authentic* (Mgr Batiffols and Saltet⁵ in France) have serious grounds for regarding them *as forgeries*!, due to the Arians, who endeavoured to protect themselves by Liberius' authority, or who wished to discredit him by their calumnies.

Conclusion. Whatever may be thought on this question, there is no doubt that the Pope was slandered. It was said, says Sozomen⁶, that Liberius had condemned the ὁμοούσιον and declared that the Son was *unlike* (ἀνόμοιον) the Father; an obvious untruth, which nevertheless deceived even such friends as Hilary. Moreover, those who admit "the fall of Liberius"⁷ recognise that "it had no influence on the rest of his pontificate" and they praise the attitude he adopted in 358. No doubt, says Mgr Batiffol⁸, "Liberius did not speak out so courageously as Hilary or Athanasius had done. But during the critical years between 358 and 361 Liberius was not in a position to make himself heard :... the disorder present in the whole of the episcopate, during that unforeseen crisis, is a sound proof that the universal episcopate cannot do without the Primacy of the successor of Peter". The political triumph of the heretics, however, was short-lived; the Catholic world soon reacted in favour of Nicaea, and [When that time came, Liberius was not found wanting ".

*

¹ *Hire et Fortuiationien*, article in *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Hist.*, 1908.

² *Studien zu Hilarius*, Vienna, 1910.

³ *Libère*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 631-659.

⁴ Chiefly Saint Athanasius (see p. 331), Saint Hilary (see p. 345) and Saint JÉRÔME (*Ononide* 2365 and *De viris*, 37). Other critics think that Saint Basil's testimony is based on forged letters.

⁵ *La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme*, p. 446 sq., 490 sq. 515 sq.

⁶ In *liull. liti, eccl.*, 1905, 1907.

⁷ They insist on the text of the letters, give another interpretation to the other miscellaneous documents, and bring to light a number of favourable testimonies. See Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, IV, ch. 14.

⁸ Amann, *Diet, thiol.*, art. *Libère*, col. 654.

⁹ *La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme*, p. 521.

¹⁰ He cites the above mentioned studies, see J. Zeiller's general bibliography *d'anc. liti, et d'arch. dirti.*, 1913, p. 20-51. See also A. r/Al.Ès, *Les papes* in *Did. Apoi.*, col. 1842-1851.

CHAPTER IV.

Saint Athanasius.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: *P. G.*, 25-28.

2. Studies: Besides the earlier *Lives* of Papebroch (in *Acta Sanctorum*), B. De Montfaucon (in *P. G.*, 25, p. Lix sq.), and Tille Mont (*Mémoires*, vin, 1-258), see G. Bardy, *Saint Athanase* (Coll. *Zzi Saints'*), Paris, 1914; J. Mohler, *Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit*, Mainz, 1827; F. Bohringer, *Athanasius und Arius*, Stuttgart, 1874; E. FIALON, *Saint Athanase*, Paris, 1877 (literary study with translation of the text of the "Apology to Constantius" and "Apology for his Flight"); F. Cavallera, *Saint Athanase* (Cd\ *La Pensée chrét.*), Paris, 1908; X. Le Bachelet, *Athanase (Saint)* in *Diet, théol.*, col. 2143-2178; G. Voisin, *La doctrine christologique de Saint Athanase*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1, (1900), p. 226-248; P. Batiffol, *La paix constantienne et le catholicisme*, ch. vi, vu, vin, ix.; J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, π, p. 67-75 Gk» *doctrine trinitaire de saint Athanase*).

I. LIFE OF SAINT ATHANASIUS. HIS CHARACTER.

A) Under Constantine. Beginnings of the episcopate.

Saint Athanasius was born in Egypt, perhaps at Alexandria, about 295, where he received a sound classical and Christian education¹. He was ordained lector in 312 and filled this office for six years. In 318 he was raised to the diaconate and acted as secretary to Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria. The apologetical treatises, which he composed at this time, show that even before. Arianism came to a head his chief doctrinal interest was the Incarnate Word. One can imagine that he was far from disinterested in the condemnation of Arius. He accompanied his bishop to the Council of Nicaea, but it is hardly probable, given his youth and condition, that he played such an important part as is implied in certain panegyrics. Nevertheless fifteen years later the Egyptian bishops, in a letter to the Catholic world, recalled that Athanasius' decided attitude against Arian impiety in the Synod of Nicaea had already earned him

¹ For the anecdote of how Athanasius, while yet a child, baptised several of his Pagan comrades, see G. Bardy, *of. cit.*, p. 3-4. The story is found in Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, 1. 14.

their hatred'. It is possible that he was allowed to speak with the bishops. In any case, it was from this time that he devoted himself entirely to the defence of the faith. After Alexander's death in 328a, he was called to succeed him. The laity acclaimed him with the cry: "He is a sincere, virtuous man, a good Christian, an ascetic, a true bishop!" He was consecrated on the 7th June.

Saint Athanasius' episcopate lasted 45 years (328-373). It falls naturally into three unequal periods, each one interrupted by one or two periods of banishment.

a) First controversies, under Constantine (328-337).

b) The great controversies, under Constantius II (337-361).

c) Last controversies and victory, after Constantius II (361-373).

Right from the beginning of his rule Athanasius was laced with the turbulent party of *Meletians* 3, who, although they had submitted to Alexander (end of 327) refused to recognise his young successor. The better to resist him they threw in their lot with the *Arians*, and took their complaints to the Emperor. Summoned by the Emperor in 331, Athanasius completely justified himself. Nevertheless the campaign of calumny went on, and increased in violence when Athanasius refused to recognise Arius, who had been rehabilitated by the Emperor (333). He was called before the Synod of Caesarea (333-334) but refused to appear. In 335 another synod was held at *Fyre* attended by a great number of Eastern bishops. Many Eusebians were present. Athanasius was charged with violence and cruelty by the *Meletians*. A commission of inquiry, composed only of

¹ Letter quoted by Athanasius, *Ap. cont. Arian.*, 6. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 15. For a slightly different reading, see F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 29. #

According to the Paschal letters. Saint Athanasius says (*Ap. cont. Ar.*, 59) Alexander died five months after the Council, meaning by that no doubt the subscription of the Meletians (327) to the Nicene decisions which concerned them. This is Mgr Duchesne's opinion, *Hist. Anc. Egl.*, II, p. 166, n. 2.

² Followers of Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis (Egypt), who for twenty years had formed a schismatic party in the Egyptian Church. For this schism see A. Leff, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1926, p. 5-26.

³ P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 377-387.

⁴ He was accused of putting one Arsenius to death and of afterwards dismembering his body; Athanasius found Arsenius hidden in a monastery, and brought him the supposed victim safe and sound. The accusation of loose living and Kiliamisius' clever refutation thereof, narrated by Rufinus (*Hist. Eccl.*, I, 17), is mentioned neither by Athanasius nor in the Acts of the synod; it is open to doubt.

Athanasius' enemies, having conducted an inquiry in Egypt in the name of the synod, concluded that Athanasius was guilty of the charges brought against him and he was deposed by the Council; Athanasius withdrew from the Council and set out to justify himself before the Emperor. Constantine, however, forewarned by the Eusebians and desirous of safeguarding political tranquillity at any price, banished him to Trier (335) but omitted to name his successor. In 337 he was invited to return to his See by the new Emperors.

B) Life of Saint Athanasius under Constantius II (337-361).

During this reign, Athanasius suffered *two long periods of exile* (339-346 and 356-361), separated by a period of relative calm.

i. As soon as he had returned to his diocese, Athanasius set himself to the task of winning the confidence of the Egyptian bishops and monks. In 338 Saint Antony came to Alexandria to assure him of his admiration and respect. The Eusebians, however, far from confessing defeat, endeavoured to win over the new Emperor of the East. Already in 338, after a meeting at Antioch, they sent a deputation to Pope Julius I, bearing with it the Acts of the Synod of Tyre, which embodied the accusations against Athanasius. The latter, having been informed of this move, brought together one hundred bishops in Council, who denounced the Council of Tyre to Rome. But before the Pope had decided the cause, the Eusebians introduced by force a new bishop, Gregory of Cappadocia, into the Alexandrian See (339)

Saint Athanasius, banished for the second time, took refuge in *Rome*, where he found other exiles and in particular Marcellus of Ancyra. The Eastern bishops, invited to attend a Council which they themselves had proposed, replied insolently by letter. The Council was held in 341 and com-

1 During this period many assemblies of the Eastern Arian bishops were held as has already been said (p. 310), especially at Antioch in 341 (the Council /I *Encaeniis*). The 25 canons attributed to this latter, may in reality be due to any of these assemblies between 340 and 343. It should be remarked that in canons 14 and 15 there is an attempt to proscribe the *appeal to Rome*, a measure obviously aimed at Athanasius and the other deposed Catholic bishops. Appeals to Rome were founded in tradition, as witness the spontaneous appeals made by the deposed bishops, the Arians of Antioch themselves, and the explicit allusion of Julius I. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 445-447.

pletely exonerated the two appellants. The Council's decision was communicated to the Antiochians in an important letter by Julius I.* But still Athanasius was prevented from returning to his diocese, and was obliged to prolong his stay in the West. He spent his time in making known the idea of monastic life. Meanwhile Constans, who was favourable to Athanasius, endeavoured to reconcile the East and the West and to render peace to the Church by means of a new Council. He summoned the Bishop of Alexandria to Milan and later to Trier. In company with Hosius of Cordova, Athanasius quitted the latter town for Sardica, where the Council was to be held.

In spite of the departure of the Eastern Arians, who were absolutely opposed to any negotiations with Athanasius, the Council of Sardica was held in 343 and Athanasius' innocence reaffirmed. He successfully protested against the adoption of any symbol differing from that of Nicaea, and probably played an important part in the disciplinary decisions of the Council, especially regarding the *right of appeal* to the Pope, which the Arians so bitterly rejected at that time². Far from re-establishing peace, however, the Council only succeeded in making worse the persecution of Catholics in the East, and especially at Alexandria. The cessation of this persecution and Athanasius' return to his See after the death of the usurper, Gregory of Cappadocia (345), was due to the intervention of Constans. Athanasius returned from exile on October 21, 346.

* For these details see P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 407-431. In Pope Julius' letter (*P. L.*, 8, 879-908) Mgr Batiffol especially admires "that *instinct of unity* which is characteristic of the Roman Church, an *authority conscious of its Primacy*" (p. 427). The Pope did not consider himself bound by the decisions of a Council; he claimed the right of judging even the Bishop of Alexandria, and the Bishop of Antioch; he appealed to tradition: "An appeal is made to us; and justice is given here". By *hence* is meant Rome and not the East (*P. L.*, 428-429). In 346 when Athanasius returned to Alexandria, Julius sent another letter to the Alexandrians, which is still extant (*P. L.*, 8, 908-912).

² "The canons of Sardica resemble a constitution *De episcopis*," says Mgr Batiffol (*ibid.*, p. 440). Canons 14 and 15 embody measures for the *right of appeal*, which are opposed to the canons of Antioch and differ also from the traditional use. This was a compromise between the claims of the Eastern bishops and the old usage. These canons had no result in practice; Rome continued to receive appeals as she had done in the past. Nevertheless the Council of Sardica is a valuable testimony of Rome's right to receive such appeals, a right which was refused her only by the Arians. The Eastern Church received the canons of Sardica at a later date and they are still contained in Byzantine Canon 84. For Sardica, see P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 440-450.

2. For ten years Athanasius enjoyed comparative peace, and employed it to the best advantage. "First, he called a *synod* for the purpose of confirming the findings of Sardica, and then adopted a policy of vigilance and prudent conciliation which had disastrous results for the Arian faction. Two or three years later we find him in communion with more than four hundred bishops¹; even such declared enemies as Valens and Ursacius endeavoured to win his favour. To this period also must be attributed such important *works* as the "Apology against the Arians" and the treatise on the "Decrees of Nicaea". After the return of their bishop, a revival of *religious fervour* was noticeable at Alexandria and many embraced an ascetical or monastic way of life. This movement was encouraged by Athanasius; on many occasions he secured the help of the monks by making them bishops. The letter he wrote to Dracontius on one such occasion is profoundly instructive².

3. The deaths of Constantine, his protector (350), and of Pope Julius I (352) gave new hope to Athanasius' enemies who recommenced to *intrigue* for the favour of Constantine and the new Pope, Liberius (352-366). Saint Athanasius sent Serapion of Thmuis to defend him at Rome. The Pope suggested to Constantius that a Council be held for the purpose of reaching a definite agreement. Constantius accepted the proposal, but caused Athanasius to be condemned by force, first at the Council of Arles (353) and then at the Council of Milan (355), and finally introduced another usurper, George of Cappadocia, into Athanasius' See (Feb. 357). Athanasius fled to the desert among the monks, in the year that Saint Antony, patriarch of the Thebaid, his Greek friend, died (356).

Saint Athanasius' third exile lasted three years (356-362). It was during these years that he composed his greatest work, moving from place to place in order to avoid the Emperor's spies. It has been said that while in the desert he remains the "invisible patriarch of Egypt", the mind which con-

¹ It was probably at this time that Athanasius consecrated Saint Frumentius Bishop of Ethiopia, thus aiding to win this still Pagan region to Christ. See Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 9. This is confirmed by Athanasius' account of Constantius' persecution, which extended even to Ethiopia. (*Apol. ad Const.*). ¹

² X. Le Bachelet, *op. cit.*, 2148-2149. See G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 98-111.

• VILLEMEN, *Tableau de l'éloquence chrétienne au IV^e siècle*, Paris, 1910, p. 102.

trolled the patient resistance to schism as far as the Eastern limits of the Empire. The powerful works which he wrote at this time are deeds as well as treatises. His voice, crying in the desert, proclaimed aloud the principles that seemed to be forgotten in the cities. At a time when all the East was bowing down before the "Caesaropapism" of Constantius, he was almost alone in his energetic assertions of the Church's independence in things spiritual*. He kept closely in touch with contemporary events. He learned with sorrow that the Arians were boasting of the supposed defection of his friends, Osius² and Liberius³, but he remained unshaken. Basil of Ancyra's use of the word *οὐσία* in his conciliatory formula *ὁμοιουσῶ*, gave him fresh hope, an echo of which is found in the *De Synodis*, written at this time. Soon, however, the Homoeans rejected the *οὐσία* and won the favour of Constantius. On the death of the Emperor (Nov. 3, 361) the orthodox regained their freedom and Athanasius returned to Alexandria on Feb. 24, 362.

C) Last years (362-373). On his return Athanasius called a Council at Alexandria, which, in spite of the reduced number of Fathers who were present, is "rendered one

| This assertion of the independence of the Church is to be found chiefly in his *History of the Arians*. Referring to the words of Constantius in the Council of Milan' (355) : "What I want, that's the canon", and the servility of the Arian episcopate (He records the Emperor as saying "When I speak, the Syrian bishops do not stand so much on ceremony." (*Hist. Ar.*, 33), he asserts the 'incipies which were re-affirmed at Milan: "Roman power must not be confused with the government of the Church" (*Ibid.*, 34). Such a procedure subverts religion to the rule of *eunuchs* (*Ibid.*, 38) and paves the way for the *Anti-Christ*; for like the latter, Constantius: "Goes into the Holy Places where he lands and ravages them; he violates the canons and imposes his decrees by force" (*Ibid.*, 39), whereas it is proper to a religion not to impose but to persuade. The Lord forbids no one, but left each one free" (*Ibid.*, 40). See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 471-473 > 512-515.

It is possible, although by no means certain, that Osius signed the Anomoean *Symbol of Sirmium* (2nd formula). Given his age and the state of his health, it is quite possible that he was victimised. But he could never be persuaded to punish Athanasius, and this rendered any previous concession worthless.

Athanasius regarded Constantius' banishment of Liberius (356), the Bishop of the Apostolic See, as a particularly grave crime (*Hist. Ar.*, 35). He praised the latter's resistance to the Emperor and wrote : "Liberius was banished; two years later he gave way and, terrified by threats of death, he subscribed" (*Ibid.*, 36) (Also *Ap. cont. Ar.*, 89). This cannot mean that Liberius accepted Anomoeanism; Athanasius would have taken a different tone in that case; neither is this suggested by the text. It can only signify the advances made to Basil of Ancyra after two years of exile (358). (See above p. 324). Athanasius' information on these matters must necessarily have been fragmentary and even confused.

of the most important held during the Arian controversy, both by the authority it acquired and the part it played in the triumph of the Nicene faith ", It has been termed " the Council of Confessors ". It was guided by Saint Athanasius, who opened the way to a conciliation. From a *doctrinal point of view*, the Council agreed not to consider the formula of the *three hypostases* as necessarily opposed to the faith of Nicaea. This formula was especially dear to the Antiochians, who understood hypostasis in the sense of person, while in Egypt and in the West it was chiefly regarded as being synonymous with οὐσία, or substance. This verbal concession, so important for the East, is found in the synodal letter (*Tomas'*) to the Antiochians. *As regards discipline*, the Council adopted a mild and conciliatory attitude with regard to those who had shown Arian tendencies, provided they were in good faith. This attitude was blamed by Lucifer, and the Luciferian schism was the outcome of his opposition.

It is in no way strange that the closing years of Athanasius should be marked with other periods of exile. Even while he presided the Council he was singled out for persecution. At the end of the year, October 362, he was again forced to leave Alexandria, but eight months later, when *Julian the Apostate* fell (June 363), he was able to return. Still later, under *Valens*, he had to hide himself for a fifth time at the gates of Alexandria (in his father's tomb?), but this last exile was fairly short (Oct. 365-Feb. 366).

Saint Athanasius' whole life was extraordinarily active. Everywhere, not only in Egypt but also throughout the Church, he encouraged and supported the defenders of the traditional faith and fought with heresy. He it was who prevented the bishops of Latin Africa from substituting the creed of Rimini for the Creed of Nicaea, and who urged Pope Damasus to depose the Arian bishops, Ursacius and Valens and take action against Auxentius of Milan. He welcomed Marcellus of Ancyra when he abjured his errors; he lent his aid to Saint Basil crying out for aid in his work of bringing peace to the East; and it is possible that he attacked Apollinarius with the pen. He died on May 2nd 373, and was one of the first bishops, not a martyr, to receive public veneration.

D) Character of Saint Athanasius.

In many respects the name of Saint Athanasius is symbolical : it stands for a doctrine and is synonymous with fortitude. In the fourth century, Athanasius was the embodiment of the *θεοοὐσία* if not of the word itself (others used this word more frequently than he) at least of the idea signified by the term ; the doctrine of the *Divinity of the Word*. Against this doctrine, towards the middle of the fourth century in the East, seemed to be gathered together all the forces of the world ; the Empire and its minions, the bishops themselves, philosophers and learned men : Athanasius seemed alone in his resistance, but as a historian has said " As long as such a man remained, the fight was far from lost ". He was a power in himself.

His strength of soul was rendered all the more indomitable by the fact that it had a greater and more powerful source than the most richly endowed of natural faculties. He was upheld by a *holy passion*, the love of Christ which had inflamed him from the time of his youth '. In his bold defence of the unfathomable mystery of the Trinity, or his courageous affirmations of the sacred rights of his Church, he felt that he was doing Christ's work. There is the explanation of his calm and unruffled assurance which never doubted of the final victory.

He knew this victory would come from God ; meanwhile he neglected no means of achieving it. Combining *prudence* and *suppleness* with fortitude, he defended and attacked, resisted and fled, tempered the ardent and stimulated the weak. Unlike Lucifer of Cagliari, he knew how to condescend when purely formal concessions presented no danger to his doctrine. Saint Epiphanius said of him : " He persuaded, he exhorted, he met resistance with force and violence²". Should this latter be taken literally? If so, it is certain that Athanasius resorted to force only in exceptional circumstances. His was not a violent character, and in this he differs from Lucifer of Cagliari. He himself declared: " It is the business of religion not to impose but to persuade ³".

His defence of the most profound of all the mysteries must necessarily have been implemented by a clear and penetrating mind; he did not, however, lose himself in subtleties.

¹ See below p. 345. — ² Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 68, 5. — ³ *Hist. Arian.*, 67.

When proving a dogma, he accumulated a great number of testimonies which he examined from every angle, just as when faced with an adversary, he was able to produce a mass of carefully classified documents. Arguments founded on fact were particularly suited to Athanasius, for his was a clear, precise and *positive* mind, accustomed to expressing itself in sober rather than in flowery language, and given to orderly and methodical composition. All these qualities had their share in making of Athanasius an unrivalled man of action, who employed them all without exception in the greatest of causes.

II. WORKS OF SAINT ATHANASIUS.

These will be studied in the following order: i. controversial works; 2. doctrinal treatises; 3. exegetical and spiritual writings; 4. letters; 5. doubtful and apocryphal writings.

A) Controversial works.

1. The Apology against the Arians ¹ was written in 348 as an answer to those who denied the lawfulness of his return after the second exile. Therein the author sums up the phases through which the controversy had passed since 330: "This work is no more than a collection of documents... Saint Athanasius included only those texts which spoke in his favour. Any which could be used against him were omitted." The work is more a powerful controversial pamphlet than a history: an incomplete but nevertheless trustworthy apology.

2. The Apology to the Emperor Constantius ² was commenced shortly after 350 and finished in the desert after the usurpation of George of Cappadocia. Written for the purpose of proving that the author had not upheld the claims of the intruder, Magnentius, it is one of Athanasius' best works. The style is grave and the writer never departs from a calm, dignified and respectful tone. There are perhaps traces of irony to be seen in the praise of the Emperor's virtue and piety, as well as in the official titles which are showered upon him.

3. The Apology for his Flight ³ is quite different in tone to the preceding work in which he had still spared his enemies. Here, he comes out into the open and gives names and definite facts. He reveals the plots of those who slandered him, describes the crimes committed at the orders of the usurper George, and tells how the Churches mourn for their pastors. He explains that he took flight not because he was afraid, but

* P. G., 25, 239-410. See G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, 111-113. Chapters 89 and 91 were added later and seem to be authentic. They deal with the fall of Libellus and Osius.

* P. G., 25, 595-642. See *ibid.*, p. 139-140.

3 P. G., 25, 643-680. See *ibid.*, p. 140-142. The homily in the third nocturnal of the Saint's feast is taken from this work.

by a sense of duty, so that he could continue to affirm the truth unhindered. The work closes as it began with an indignant account of the Arians' conduct (357).

4. The History of the Arians', for the monks, relates to the hermits, "in a lively, vivid style, well suited to simple and trusting souls," the combats he had waged since 335 against the wicked men who had exiled him. In this work, "The impressive series of official documents (found in the Apology against the Arians), are replaced by the author's own account, full of imagery and picturesque detail... (He) is virulent, sometimes carried away by unreflecting criticism. But he can hardly be blamed for that. His sufferings had earned him the right to avenge himself, to tell his adversaries what he thought of them and show his contempt." His bold affirmation of the independence of the Church with regard to the State is particularly noteworthy⁵.

E) Doctrinal treatises.

1. The Discourse against the Greeks³, written about 318-320, may be divided into two parts: only the first can be regarded as a direct refutation of Paganism (1-29); the second, on the contrary, explains the two ways by which man can come to a knowledge of God: the study of the soul, and the study of the external world (30-47).

2. The Discourse on the Incarnation of the Words written at the same time, forms a sequel to the preceding work, and originally was a part of the same writing. Saint Athanasius therein explains how the Incarnation was *morally necessary* so that man could be redeemed and the knowledge of God, together with his lost immortality, restored to him. He then proves the truth of Christianity by the prophecies and the moral transformation of the world. These two works are easily seen to be youthful compositions, but each page, strictly classical in style, speaks of Athanasius' faith and his love for the Word made flesh.

3. The Discourses against the Arians⁴ would appear to be Saint Athanasius' chief dogmatical work. They contain "the first synopsis of Catholic teaching after the rise of Arianism". The three first discourses are certainly authentic, but the fourth is probably apocryphal. The first proves that neither the Scriptures nor human reason are opposed to

³ *I.*, 27, 25, 691-796. See *ibid.*, p. 142-144.

See above, Life of Saint Athanasius, p. 341 note I. For these last three writings, see also P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 508-515.

⁴ *I.*, 25, 3-96. See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 211-233.

⁵ *I.*, 25, 95-198. *Ibid.*, p. 233-283.

I., 26, 11-467 (4th discourse: 467-526); *ibid.*, 431-67 (long extracts).

the fact that the Word is eternal, engendered and unchangeable; the second gives a Catholic explanation of the text of Proverbs VIII, 22 : *Dominus creavit me*; the third shows that the nature of the Father and the Son is one: the great number of objections find their answer in the radical distinction of the Divine and human natures in Christ, and in the application to the latter of all those passages of Scripture which imply inferiority or weakness. Athanasius does not yet admit the formula of the three hypostases, which proves that the work was written previous to 362 and also probably to the treatise on the *synods*. It is generally thought that it dates from the third exile between 356-359. Some, however, place the date as early as 347-350 (Cavaliere), or even 338-339 (Loofs), but they cannot produce definite proofs of this.

4. The Treatise on the Synods of Rimini and Seleucia | narrates what took place at these assemblies and makes a striking contrast between the fixity of the Nicene faith and the many divergent formulas adopted by the Arians. The author declares that there is not really an essential disagreement between Nicaea and the more moderate of the latter, especially Basil of Ancyra. The writing dates from 359.

Note.—The *doctrinal letters*, many of which run to a considerable length, have much in common with these works.

C) Exegesis and Spirituality.

1. Of the exegetical labours of Athanasius all that remains, besides various fragments (chiefly on Job), is the Explanation of the Psalms which is almost complete and which is chiefly concerned with the spiritual and moral sense. A writing *On the titles of the Psalms*, mentioned by Saint Jerome³, would appear to be lost. It would seem that it is not identical with the following work.

2. In the short treatise addressed to *Marcellinus*, *On the Interpretation of the Psalms*⁴, which is certainly authentic, the author recalls the advice he once received from a holy and aged man on the study and proper use of the Psalms; he insists on their excellence, their prophetic sense, and the way in which they can all be applied to everyday life.

3. The Life of Saint Antony⁵, written about 360, probably for the monks of the West, consists in great measure of a long discourse in which the author sums up the Saint's teaching on the spiritual life (n. 16-43). This is admirably illustrated by the story of the Saint which

³ *P. G.*, 26, 677-792. F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 178-188.

^{*} *P. G.*, 27, 59-546.

¹ *De viris iti.*, 87; *P. L.*, 23, 731.

⁴ *P. G.*, 27, 10-46.

⁵ *P. C.*, 26, 838-976.

precedes and accompanies it. This little book was soon translated into Latin and became extremely popular both in the East and the West¹.

4. The little treatise *On Virginity*³ also seems to be from the hand of Saint Athanasius (353-373 circa), in spite of the use of the word ὑπόστασι in the strict sense of person. "This beautiful little book, written with admirable simplicity, forms a precious manual for the Christian virgin, reminding her of her duties and the means of sanctification, without having recourse to, or insisting upon, extraordinary austerities". Another treatise *De Virginitate* was edited under Athanasius' name in 1927³.

D). Letters.

Although Saint Athanasius' letters do not possess that familiar and affectionate tone which so adds to the charm of certain collections of correspondence, they are nevertheless really important from a *historical* and especially *doctrinal* point of view. They may be classed under two heads: the *official* and the *doctrinal* letters.

1. The official letters are of two kinds :

n) The *Festal* or *Paschal* letters are letters which the bishop addressed (0 his flock in order to inform them of the date of Easter and to exhort them to communion and the practice of the Christian virtues. Fifteen, written in the years 329-348, are still extant in a Syriac translation.*

b) Three *Synodal letters*⁵, written by Athanasius in the name of the three Councils held at Alexandria, in 362 (Tome to the Antiochians), in 363 (Epistle to Jovianus on faith), and in 369 (Epistle to the Africans).

c) Two *Encyclical letters* which he wrote to the bishops to defend himself against those who calumniated him ; one written in 340 and the other about 357-358.

2. The doctrinal letters, especially those which deal with dogma, are especially important :

a) The *Epistle On the Doctrine of Dionysius*, written about 350-353 to two bishops, proves that the Arians have no right to base their teaching on that of Dionysius of Alexandria. This letter is really a historical and doctrinal treatise⁷.

¹ Saint Augustine in his *Confessions*, bk. VIH, vi, 13-14, remarks on tire pro- tu he derived from the story of Saint Antony at the time of his conversion.

² *P. G.*, 28, 251-282; re-edited by Von der Goltz in *Texte und Unters.*, iv (1905). p. 35-60, with critical study. O. Bardenhewer also admits the authenticity of this work, *Geschichte*, in, p. 66. J. Lebon, *op. cit.*, is hesitant.

³ By J. Lebon, in the *Musson*, 1927 (t. XL), p. 205-248.

⁴ *P. G.*, 26, 1360-1444. The Syriac text was discovered in 1842-47. These letters fix the dates in the author's life.

⁵ *P. G.*, 26, 793-810; 813-824; 1029-1048. Tome (τόμο) signifies doctrinal planation.

⁶ *P. G.*, 25, 221-240; 537-594.

⁷ *P. G.*, 25, 479-522-

b) The Epistle *On the Decrees of Nicaea* justifies the use of the expressions $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\omicron$ and $\zeta\kappa\ \tau\eta\ \omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$ although they are not found in the Scriptures. It is of greater general interest than the preceding letter and dates from the same period.

c) The *four letters to Serapion* * contain Saint Athanasius' doctrine on the Divinity of the Holy Ghost.

d) Three letters deal with the Incarnation, in connection with the first Christological controversies, which seem to have been raised by the Apollinarians about 370 (to Epictetus, Adelphius and Maximus 3).

e) Several letters deal with asceticism 4; they are addressed to Dracontius, Rufinianus and Ammones. A letter to the monks was chiefly intended to put them on their guard against Arianism.

Five or six other letters are extant on various subjects of lesser importance 5.

E) Doubtful or apocryphal works 6.

A very great number of works have been attributed to Saint Athanasius on insufficient grounds, or even without any grounds at all. These are of all kinds.

1. The majority are controversial treatises:

d) Some written against the Arians. Explanation of the faith; the book of the treatise *Contra Arianos*;

h) others against the Apollinarians: Concerning the Incarnation against Apollinarius;

e) others again, on the contrary, are due to the Apollinarians themselves, who endeavoured to cover their leaders' teaching with the authority of Saint Athanasius: On the Incarnation of the Word of God: On the Unity of Christ.

2. The following have also been attributed to him:

a) A *Synopsis of the Scriptures*, with various homilies;

g) a number of *disciplinary writings* (ecclesiastical canons, discovered in 1904);

c) a number of *letters*, and especially two to Lucifer of Cagliari, which say the least have been considerably interpolated by the Luciferian schismatics'.

* P. G., 25, 415-476.

† P. G., 26, 529-676. See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 188-204.

§ P. G., 26, 1049-1090.

* P. G., 25, 523-534; 26, 1169-1176; 1179-1182; 1185-1186. — 5 p. a.,

4 The majority are in P. G., 28, but others may be found in the first volumes of P. G., 25, 26, 27.

† See L. Salabert, in *Bull. litt. Eccl.*, 1906, p. 300-326.

3. The best known of the apocryphal writings bearing Athanasius' name is the symbol *Quicumque vult*. Since the eighth or the ninth century it has been called the Athanasian Creed but this is certainly an erroneous attribution. It was probably due to that fact that he was so closely connected with the triumph of the term consubstantial, and the first Christological controversies, and because this Creed is characterised by its precise expressions concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation. For the most part these expressions are taken from Saint Augustine¹; moreover, the stress which is laid on the doctrine of the Incarnation supposes that the great Christological controversies had already opened: the Creed is therefore posterior to Nestorianism (430). Again, it is mentioned for the first time in a sermon attributed to Saint Augustine, but which is really due to Saint Caesarius of Arles (d. 543). It must therefore have been composed after 430 and before 540, or even, according to Tixeront, before 500, for after this date it would seem that the comparison of the union of the body and soul used to explain the hypostatic union was no longer employed. It is certainly a Latin work, and must have been composed in Gaul among the group of writers connected with Arles or Lerins³. It was incorporated in the Roman Office after the tenth century. This work of an unknown theologian expresses so powerfully and so clearly the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation that it is rightly ranked with the definitions of the Councils and the infallible teaching of the Church⁴.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT ATHANASIUS.

A) General outline of his doctrine.

i. Saint Athanasius was not only an untiring man of action and a courageous fighter; he was also, in the strictest meaning of the word, *a man of doctrine*. Yet he was not "a theologian" in the technical acceptance of the term. He was a doctor who *commented dogma* as he received it from tradition and the Scriptures... He had no time to give to pure speculation... The works of Saint Athanasius may be searched in vain for any trace of a system, that is to say a series of principles co-ordinating and linking together dogmatic truths from which it is possible to deduce new conclusions⁵. Moreover, a well constructed vocabulary in which the terms are all strictly defined is the "*indispensable tool of the theologian*"; and Athanasius lacked such a tool⁶". He nearly always gave the same meaning to *ουσία* and to *ὑπόστασις*;

¹ J. Tixeront, *Athanasius (Symbole de Saint)*, in *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, col. 2178-2187.

² H. Brewer, who attributes it to Saint Ambrose, has not taken this fact sufficiently into account.

³ J. G. Morin, who first attributed it to Saint Caesarius of Arles, admitted that it may have been composed in Spain in the second half of the sixth century. — J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, col. 2186-2187.

⁴ Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 33. — G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 149.

and although in the Council of 362 he let pass the expression, *three hypostases*, in the letter to the Africans in 369 he wrote that hypostasis means substance. He often employed tenir-lacking precision (similarity of the Father and the Son, similarity according to the substance...) which led prejudiced or hasty readers to believe that he rejected consubstantiality!}, But in reality "the idea of consubstantiality is found in all his works, although it is sometimes placed side by side with doubtful expressions!".

2. In the first half of the fourth century, when so many important dogmatic questions were discussed, there was no one who equalled Athanasius as a doctor. He was a man sent by Providence, who having recognised and affirmed traditional truth received the mission of bringing about its triumph independently of, and often enough in spite of, philosophical subtleties. Thus, "although it may be said that he contributed almost nothing to theological speculation, he was a master in dogma. It seems to me that no other in the fourth century surpasses him for the breadth of doctrinal development, the richness of spiritual foundation... and above, all for that depth of Christian instinct which leads him to seek, quite naturally, the special aspect of each doctrine which most intimately affects the soul, giving it new life and energy in the pursuit of good 23.

B) Fundamental points of his doctrine.

His teaching on the *Trinity*, and even more so his doctrine of the *Redemption*, deserves special mention.

I. With regard to the Trinity, "Athanasius is never tired of enouncing, on every possible occasion and in every possible way, the two or three principles in which he sums up the mystery of the Trinity: The *Son* proceeds from the Father by generation, and not by creation; He therefore belongs to the substance of the Father, whose image He is, He is the *brilliance* which cannot be separated from the light 3. The Holy Ghost in His turn belongs to the substance of the Son from Whom He receives it; and since the Son is in the Father, as the Spirit is in the Son, of Whom He is the

1 *ibid.*, See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 215.

a F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

3 See especially the *Discourses against the Arians* and the treatise *On Synods*.

nuage*, there exists in the Trinity a *mysterious union of* *dure*, which, in a common substance produces a common operation, quite unlike the *moral union* which is the only one ¹ tamable by creatures. Athanasius takes no interest in anything which goes beyond these assertions. He desires the mind to respect the mystery, and he goes no further than what is contained in Scripture²". Hence there is in God, with the *Father*, a *Son* who forms but one nature with Him (τὸ ὅλον), and Who is eternally engendered from His substance, and a *Holy Spirit* Who receives from the Son all that He possesses (ἀ ἐχέ. τοῦ υἱοῦ ἕστο, *Scrap.*, III, i), or possesses it by the Son (διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ). This rudimentary but nevertheless sound conception of the Trinity was completed by the Cappadocians.

2. The Arian teaching on the Word was based on the idea of the divine transcendence and the need of an intermediary between God and created beings. To this philosophical position Saint Athanasius opposed another, the mystery of the Redemption.

«) If he was so active in his struggle with Arianism, it was because the latter robbed him of his Saviour when it refused to acknowledge Him as God. He asks how man can be redeemed if Christ is not God. "If Christ had not been, of Himself, the substantial image of the Father, if He was God only by borrowing and participation, He could never have formed the likeness of God in anyone, since He Himself would have been no more than a God-like being. For he who possesses nothing that he has not borrowed from another can communicate nothing to others, since what he has, instead of being really his, remains the possession of the giver, and the gifts he has received serve only to cover his poverty and nakedness³".

¹ See the letters to Serapion, chiefly letters I, II, IV. He does not say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son (the verb, to proceed, ἐκπορεύομαι, is used to signify derivation from a principle which itself has no principle) but he says the same thing when he says "what He has, is of the Son" (F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 35-36. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 67-75. I. De Synodis, c. 51. Saint Athanasius' Christology in the strict sense of the word will not be dealt with here. His need for treating especially of the divinity of Christ explains why he insisted less on the human nature. In the beginning of the time he often referred to the latter with the words σαρξ, σῶμα. In doing, he did not deny the existence of a spiritual soul, which he explicitly affirmed from 362, after the first Apollinarian denials. See J. Voisin, *op. cit.*, II, 248.

ι) Athanasius was the first to dwell at any length on the reasons for the Incarnation, and his ideas were subsequently adopted by most of the Greek Fathers. Given that God was determined to redeem fallen man, He must have taken the way of the Incarnation. And Athanasius proved this by eliminating three other conceivable solutions :

1. Without going back on His word, God could not extend His pardon purely and simply; 2. God could not let man perish, lest the devil triumph; 3. God could not allow Himself to be satisfied by any amends that man offered, for even should these make satisfaction for sin, they offered no remedy for corruption and death, which are the heritage of sin and which are intimately knit up with human nature.

c) Saint Athanasius regards the act of Redemption as consisting chiefly in the union of the Word to human nature.

In this connection it should be remembered that the soteriological ideas of the Fathers may be reduced to three principal theories.

1. Some hold that the Word has saved us chiefly by means of His union to human nature; this is the theory of union, also termed *mystical*, speculative and physical.

2. Others thought that Christ saved us by taking our place in order to pay our debt to God by His sufferings and His death; this is the theory of satisfaction, also called the *realist* theory.

3. For others again, the life and blood of Christ are the price of our redemption, paid to the devil whose property we have been made by sin; this is the theory of the rights of the devil.

It should be noted that these theories are but different aspects of one and the same reality, and by no means exclude one another. The *second* is essential and is developed by all the Fathers, even those who are especially interested in the two others. The *third* is no more than a somewhat strange and oratorical method of explaining the second. The first was chiefly exposed in the East (Saint Hilary alone developed it in the West, probably under the influence of Saint Athanasius) and especially by Saint Athanasius and Gregory of Nyssa.

Saint Athanasius employs the *first* theory in order to demonstrate the full divinity of Our Lord to the Arians. He regards the salvation of man as a *divinisation*, implying *divine sonship*, resemblance to God and immortality of the body. Our nature (essence) is in fact *Verbified* in a certain measure in the (individual) nature assumed by the Word. We all participate in some way in the privileges of Christ,

* *De Incarti. Verbi*, vi-ix.

3 J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, ch. tx, p. 142-151.

3 *Contra arianos*, in, 33.

we are *concorporeal* with Him (σὺσσωμοι). "God became man for us, so that we might become gods x". An elevated and beautiful spiritual teaching was the natural outcome of this doctrine.

C) Spirituality.

1. Our *participation of the divinity of Jesus Christ* has, as a necessary result, our perfect moral union with Him. And through Jesus Christ we are united to the Father, the Son of God and the Holy Ghost. For Athanasius, the words Father, Son and Holy Ghost, are not merely ideas, but concrete living realities in which he lives and which live in him, causing him to vibrate with religious emotion to the depths of his being; as G. Bardy² remarks, many pages of his writings resemble a spiritual meditation more than a theological thesis. Saint Athanasius was a believer and a mystic who contemplated the Trinity, not with any purpose of comprehending the mystery, but in order to admire it and find therein the spiritual food for his soul, and for his flock.

2. This perfect knowledge of the divine mysteries, and of Christ in particular, was, moreover, the result of that *asceticism* which purifies the soul. Saint Athanasius, at the end of the treatise *On the Incarnation of the Word*, says, "Together with a deep study of the Scriptures and true knowledge, an honest life, a pure soul and Christian virtue are necessary if the soul, having practised these things, would obtain and possess what it desires in the measure that it is possible for human nature to learn of the Word of God."

1 The words of the saints cannot be understood without pure thoughts and without imitating their life... He who would comprehend the ideas of theologians must first purify and cleanse his soul by his way of life, and draw near to the saints by resembling them in his actions³".

3. Thus Saint Athanasius in one of the works of his youth. Such ideas explain why he became such an admirer and untiring exponent of monasticism, which is eminently in life of asceticism in which the soul finds purification. He has admirably explained its "spirit" in his treatise *On Vir-* while he exposes its practices and difficulties in his

¹ ὁ αὐτὸ γὰρ ἐνηνθρόπησεν ἵνα ἡμεῖς Θεοποιηθῶμεν. *De incarti. Verbi* 54.

• (s. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 150-151. See also p. 8 9.

¹ *De Ineam. Verbi* 57 (Trans. F. Cavaillera, *op. cit.*, p. 274-275.

Life of Saint Anthony. No doubt the devils occupy a large place, as they do in similar works of the period*. But even if there should be some measure of exaggeration in this respect, not all should be regarded as pure imagination; and still less should we neglect the extremely wise and moderate advice that Athanasius tendered to the monks, not only for the discernment of spirits but also as regards the attainment of an intense interior life, and the union of the soul with God by means of the struggle with the passions. Nevertheless however much Athanasius held the monastic life in esteem! he sometimes considered an active *apostolate* as being more useful and meritorious. This may be seen in his letter to Dracontius, who quitted his diocese in order to return to the solitary life.

He was well aware, however, that it is quite possible to combine the exercises of the contemplative life with the labours of the active life. He himself exemplified this truth so well that it can safely be said that his strength of soul and admirable soundness in doctrine were due more to his interior life than to his natural talents.

CHAPTER V.

Saint Hilary of Poitiers.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: P. G. 9-10. *Corpus of Vienne*, 1916, t. lxxv (ed. L. Feder, S. J.); *Ibid.*, 1891, t. xxn: *Comment, on the Psalm*.

2. Studies: X. Le Bachelet, *Hilaire (saint) in Did. thiol.*, 2jfl 2462. R. P. Largent, *Saint Hilaire* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1912. L. Feder, *Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers*, Vienne, 1910-1912. F. Gamurrini, 5. *Hilarii tractatus de mysteriis et hymni*, Rome 1908. Dom WILMART, in *Lev. Bénéd.*, 1907, 1908. G. Rasneur, *L'homéisme dans ses rapports avec l'orthodoxie*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1911 (2 articles, of which the second deals almost entirely with St. Hilary). P. Batiffol, *La paix constantinienne et le catholicisme*. A. Beck, *Die Trinitätslehre der heil. Hilarius von Poitiers*, Mainz, 1903. (The author, as well as G. Rauschen, has several studies *On the possibility*

* See below p. 510. See also P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne*, p. 217. — See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 341-349.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

Saint Hilary was born at Poitiers about 315, probably of rich Pagan parents, who afforded him a sound literary education. He became a rhetor. At the beginning of his treatise on the Trinity he relates that while he was studying the problem of fate, his conversion was brought about by his reading the prologue to the Gospel of Saint John, in which it is explained that the Word was made flesh in order to make us sons of God x. He was baptised about 345. At this time he was married and had one daughter, Abra. First a fervent Christian and then a priest, it was not long before he was appointed to the See of Poitiers, at a time when the Arian troubles were at their height². His strength of character immediately brought him to the fore. It is not known whether he was present at the synods of Arles and Milan, but he was the leader of a synod held at Paris (end of 355) in which the Gallic bishops there present disassociated themselves from the chief exponents of Arianism in the West: Ursacius and Valens (bishops of Pannonia) and Saturninus of Arles. The latter caused another synod to be held at Beziers, at which Hilary was obliged to assist by order of Constantine. He refused to submit to the Emperor's religious policy and was exiled to Phrygia (356).

Saint Hilary's exile lasted four years (356-360). He remained Bishop of Poitiers and administered his diocese by correspondence. Meanwhile he put his enforced leisure to good purpose by studying Eastern theological speculation, and paid close attention to the progress of the Arian controversies. From this point of view his stay in the East was of immense advantage to him, and its fruits may be perceived in his treatise on the Trinity. He gave his support to the moderate Arians in their resistance to the Anomoeans, while at the same time he endeavoured to clear up the misunderstandings which existed between the Catholics and the former, especially the homoiousians. This is plainly to be seen in the *De Synodis*, written about 358-359 at the

¹ /> *Trinit.*, I. 10 sq.

² Saint Martin's connection with Saint Hilary dates from the beginning of his episcopate. The monastery of Ligugé however, was not founded until 411, under the Bishop's patronage. See Dom Chamard, *Les origines de Poitiers*, Paris, 1874.

request of the Gallic bishops who desired information on Eastern affairs¹. He did not hesitate to speak for the Hoinoiousians in their quarrel with the Homoeans at the Council of Seleucia (359). He then came to Constantinople (360), from whence he sent a memorandum to Constantius (*Ad Constantium liber IIUS*) asking to be allowed to confront Saturninus of Arles who was responsible for his exile. The Emperor refused this request, but allowed Hilary to return to his diocese, in order, as Sulpicius Severus² relates, to prevent him from causing more trouble in the East. But when the Emperor showed his bad faith by favouring the victorious Homoean party, Hilary wrote against him (Springtime 360) a virulent pamphlet, which was not published till later: this is the *Contra Constantium*, often called, with good cause, the *Invective*.

On this return to Gaul (360), Saint Hilary at once applied himself to propagating Christian life, especially by the spread of monasticism, and endeavoured to bring about the triumph of the Nicene faith by leading the strayed sheep back to the fold. It was due to him that many synods were held throughout the country, while at Paris, probably in 362, was held a national Council which anticipated the work of the Council of Alexandria, convoked by Saint Athanasius. In 362, Saint Hilary went to Italy, where for two years, together with Saint Eusebius of Vercelli, he worked successfully for the widespread recognition of Nicaea. He was very firm in doctrinal matters, but showed himself indulgent in practice, thereby bringing down on his head the wrath of Lucifer of Cagliari, but gaining the approval of Pope Liberius. He was less successful, however, in his struggle against Auxentius, the Homoean Bishop of Milan, whom he failed to have depot>!

¹ In reality Saint Hilary's attitude towards the moderate Arians was that of Pope Liberius in 358. Liberius then made up for any weakness he might have shown in the preceding year. Nevertheless he censured the Pope in the letters of the *Opus historicum*, written in 359-360: *perfidiam quam dicit Liberius catholicam, hi sicut qui conscripserunt* (Frag. VI, 7). The first formula of Simplicianus was in question, which in substance was identical with the third, approved by Hilary. For the authenticity see p. 334. In the *Contra Constantium* (written after having reproached the Emperor with the exile of Liberius, he adds: "I am not sure whether thou didst not act more impiously in recalling than in banishing him. This is usually taken as an allusion to the 'fall of Liberius' (358) although it may also be taken as a reference to the difficulties which were provided by his return, between his followers and those of the anti-Pope Felix (written) or yet the calculated calumnies made possible by this return. See above p. J - *Hist. Sacra.*, it, 155.

ed, since the Emperor Valentinian was satisfied with Auxentius' ambiguous profession of faith and forbade Hilary to remain in Italy (364). As a protest, Hilary composed the *Contra Auxentium* 1 for the information of the faithful so that the integrity of the faith might be maintained (365). He returned to his diocese and spent his last years in ministering to the spiritual needs of his flock. He died on January 13, 367 or 368. In 1851 the title of *Doctor of the Church* was conferred upon him.

Saint Hilary earned the surname of Athanasius of the West both by his strong character, the soundness of his doctrine and his qualities as a man of action... There is no doubt that from the latter point of view he was inferior to the Bishop of Alexandria. If the part which he played was less important and less decisive than that of Athanasius, this is due to the fact that the West was less troubled than the East and that Hilary spent only twelve years of his life in the defence of the faith. It is for the same reason that he wrote fewer works than Athanasius. He surpasses the latter, however, in his philosophical study of the controverted questions and by the originality of his ideas.

As a writer Saint Hilary is notable 2 for the elevation of his ideas, the vigorous reasoning he applies to every subject which he treats, a deep personal conviction, and a certain *impetuosity* which led Saint Jerome to call him : the Rhone of Latin eloquences. He modelled himself on Quintilian, and failed without success, as Saint Jerome again remarks 4. One feels, however, that he did not compose with facility ; his style is often tortuous, sometimes obscure, due to a lack of precision in his terminology, the length of his periods and the brilliancy of his ideas. Saint Jerome 6 classes him among the writers of eloquence 7.

1. He was very severe on these Arian bishops who, not content with having blasphemed Christ (*the Antichristi*), would base the Church on the power of the

2. Such an ambition charges Christ with impotence: "Inopsque virtutis est in christus, dum ambitio nomini suo conciliatur, arguitur." *Contra Aux.*, 4. li. Bachelet, *op. cit.*, col. 2412-2413.

3. *Cal.*, II, preface; *P. L.*, 26, 355. — * *Epist.*, LXX, 5.

4. In *hail.*, vin, preface. Elsewhere he says (*Ep.*, Lvm, to) : "Saint Hilary is like the Gallic buskin, and since he adorns himself with the flowers of Greece he makes himself happen that he engages himself in long periods. His works are like a mule for mediocre readers." This phrase, in spite of its qualifications, is injurious to Hilary's honour.

5. Saint Hilary as a writer, see J. A. Quilacq, *Quomodo lingua latina* L at S. Hilarius Pictaviensis episcopus, Tours, 1903.

II. WORKS.

A) Writings dealing with the Arian controversies.

I. The *De Trinitate* in 12 books (356-359), was less concerned with an exposition of Trinitarian doctrine than with the proof of the divinity of the Son. In the first book the author tells of his conversion and explains that his purpose is to combat Sabellianism and Arianism; book π and in establish first the concept of the three Persons and their real distinction one from the other, especially the distinction of the Father from the Son, and also the unity of their nature. The end of the work, books IV to XII, is a moi-ample development of the doctrine of the *δμοούσιο* on the Second Person; this is based on the authority of the Old and New Testaments, and the objections, especially that drawn by the Arians from the Book of Proverbs (VIH, 22 : *Dominili creavit me*), are answered. (It is quite possible that the three first books were written before his exile).

2.The *De Synodis* 2 (359), which is sometimes counted as the xmth book of the preceding work, contains, in addition to the introduction, two parts : the first (9-65) is *historical* and sets forth the many and varied formulas of faith concocted by the various Eastern synods; the second (66-91) li concerned with *dogma* and proves to the Homoiousians thal their fear of the *homoousios* is vain and that the *δμοιοῦσιο* really implies also the *δμοούσω* : *tit probari possit homo, usion, non improbemus homo-usion*.

3.The *Apologetica ad reprehensores libri "De Synodis" responsu* was Hilary's answer to the strict Nicaeans (*Luciferians*) who reproa- lie, him with taking up a too conciliatory attitude. Only small fragmen remain.

4.Three other important writings concerning the Arian struggi are mentioned in the Life of Saint Hilary ; these are:

- a) *Liber II*"s *ad Constantium Augustum* (360) <;
- b) *Contra Constantium Imperatorem* (360) s;
- c) *Contra Auxentium* or *Contra Atianos* (364-365) 6.

¹ P. L., 10, 25 472.

³ P. L., 10, 479-546.

³ P. L., 10, 545-548.

⁴ P. L., 10, 565-572. The *Liber P*" *ad Constantium* (*ibid.*, 557.5ft- really a fragment of the 1st book of the *Opus historicum*. See Dom A. Will ma I Rev. Benld., 1907-1908. Recent edit, of the two books, *Corpus* of Vu'li 1916, t. Lxv. — s P. L., 10, 577-606. — P. d., 10, 609-618.

5. A great historical work, possibly entitled *Opus historicum adversus Valentem et Ursacium*¹, is extant only in fragments*, exceedingly useful for the history of the religious difficulties of the fourth century. Unfortunately these fragments in their present state are in the utmost disorder. According to recent critical research² the work originally consisted of three books. *Book I* (written in 356 immediately after the Synod of Béziers) contains Fragment I as a *preface*, and as *documents* the address of the Council of Sardica to Constantius (wrongly ascribed to Hilary under the title of *Liber Ilus ad Constantium*), the encyclical of the Eastern bishops at Sardica to Pope Julius I (*frag. II*, 9-15), encyclical from the same bishops to the Africans (*frag. III*, 1-29). Various fragments of book II (written in 359-360 after the Councils of Rimini, Seleucia) are also extant, notably four letters of Pope Liberius, of which the letter *Studens paci* is *fragment IV*, and the three others, *fragment VI*, 5-7, 8-9, 10-11; these four letters have a great literary and doctrinal resemblance to *Book III*, written only in 367, which chiefly relates the Nicene reaction to the West after 360; in this connection may be mentioned a letter from Liberius (*fragm. XII*, 1-2) addressed to the Italian bishops: he speaks severely of those who were weak enough to give way at Rimini, deceived by the perfidy of the Arians, but he holds out to them the hope of pardon if they repent. ³ *Note.* All these documents were extracted from the *Opus historicum*, probably before the end of the fourth century, and it is possible that many of them were interpolated, especially Liberius' letters (bk. II) of which the authenticity is far from being proved⁴.

B) Other writings of Saint Hilary.

I. Commentary on Saint Matthew⁵, in 33 chapters, dates from before the exile and is in the form of a book, although originally it may have consisted of homilies. The author comments only certain chosen passages and, like Origen, insists more especially on the moral and Spiritual sense.

¹ Probably identical with the *Liber adversus Valentem et Ursacium*, mentioned in *St. Jerome* (*De Vir. ill.*, too.)

² *Ibid.*, 10, 627-724.

³ Chiefly that of Dom Wilmart and L. Feder, S. J., author of the *Corpus of VII* edition (see note 2).

⁴ See above p. 334.

⁵ On purely historical grounds Catholic critics are not agreed as to the authenticity of these letters. (There is no question here of Papal infallibility; even if the letters be authentic, they contain no proof that Liberius signed the Ilhénoan formula, which alone was explicitly heretical). The distinctions which used to be made between the first (*Studens paci*), which was usually kept in the I. I., and the three others, which were regarded as dating from the exile and Eusebian authentic, is hardly ever proposed now-a-days. It would seem that the letters stand or fall together, and the two opinions are held with equal probability. Among the recent adversaries of their authenticity are: L. Sabatier (in *Kp. Utt. eccl.*, 1905 and 1907) and P. Batiffol (in *La paix constantinienne et l'hérésie*, 1911); those in favour of the authenticity are: Mgr Duchesne (*Kp. V. uws d'Arch. et d'hist.*, 1908) and L. Feder (*Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers*, 1910); they place the date of the letter *Studens paci*, during the year 356.

2. Commentary on the Psalms', composed after 364, dealt with all the Psalms, but only sixty are now extant. Although Hilary's treatment is original, Origen's influence is evident.

3. Treatise on Job" is lost save for two insignificant fragments.

4. The Book of the Mysteries (after 360) is an explanation of the figures of the Old Testament with respect to the New. A part of it was recently discovered⁵.

5. All Saint Hilary's correspondence is lost, even his letter to his daughter, Abra. The edited text⁴ at present extant appears doubtful. It is certain, however, that Abra really existed (Feast on the 12th December).

6. The Book of Hymns, which Saint Jerome has attributed to Saint Hilary, is now lost. The authorship of the hymns which are at present ascribed to him is disputed, save three which have recently been discovered⁶. Their intricate metre renders them less suited to popular singing than those of Saint Ambrose, and they never achieved great success. Hilary himself admitted this when he remarked that "the Gauls are not very clever in singing hymns". The critics regard the three hymns of the Mozarabic breviary and the three of the Roman breviary as certainly apocryphal. The authenticity of the three others is doubtful, even the fine "morning hymn", *Lucis largitor splendide* mentioned in the letter to Abra (see above). The *Gloria in excelsis Deo*, the *Te Deum*, and two poems have also been wrongly attributed to Saint Hilary.

III. DOCTRINE OF SAINT HILARY.

A) Outline of his doctrine.

Just as Saint Hilary was one of the *first* exegetists and hymnologists in the West, so also was he a pioneer as regards *doctrine*. He is outstanding, says Fr. Le Bachelet⁸, "for having undertaken the reconciliation of two currents which, until that time, had been divergent", the Latin current represented by Tertullian, Novatian and Saint Cyprian, and the richer and more speculative Greek current which depended chiefly on Origen. Thus "Hilary gained a double advantage for Western theology; he enriched it with new and fertile elements and at the same time helped to determine and render more precise the theological terminology of the future. But he suffered the usual fate of all pioneers: those who followed him and benefited by his labours soon surpassed

¹ P. L., IO, 231-908. See new edit., by ZINGERLE, in *Corpus of Vienne*, 1891. — a P. L... IO, 923-924.

³ *Corpus of Vienna*, t. LXV (Feder's edition).

⁴ P. L... IO, 549-552. — ⁵ *De Viris ill.*, 100.

⁶ *Corpus of Vienna*, *loc. cit.* These hymns were discovered, together with *Book of Mysteries*, by J. F. Gammurini, in a manuscript of Arezzo, in 1887. J

⁷ P. L., IO, 551-554. — ⁸ *Did. thiol.*, *loc. cit.*, col. 2461.

him, either by their genius, such as Augustine, or by their style and clarity, such as Ambrose and Leo; his glory was eclipsed by theirs" L

One of the most notable characteristics of Saint Hilary as a man of doctrine was the firmness of his faith. He unceasingly dwells on this in his "De Trinitate". No doubt he applied all the powers of his mind in studying and endeavouring to understand it, but he expected but little enlightenment from *philosophy* and its subtleties: "firm faith despises the subtle and vain questions of philosophy" 2; for it was they which gave birth to Arianism 3. He extols *simple* faith: "faith is in simplicity;... it is not by difficult problems that God would have us come to the blessed life" 4. He desires a deep faith, imbuing the whole man with *piety*s. Such is the faith that leads us to understanding and knowledge. Thus, knowledge and virtue which should always be found together in a bishop, should be combined with the piety which leads to the understanding of God; an understanding which of course is always relative; "he who pursues the infinite with piety will no doubt never attain it, but he will benefit by this progression" 5. Saint Hilary had a deep-seated *realisation of mystery* when considering the infinite, and he often brings it to the notice of the Arians; nothing was more to the point at such a time.

The Bishop of Poitiers gave special study to the *Trinity* and *Christ*. Certain features of his teaching on both these doctrines may be mentioned.

B) Doctrine on the Trinity 8.

The *Trinity* was Saint Hilary's greatest preoccupation. When engaged in refuting Arianism he clearly affirmed the distinction of the Persons in order to disassociate himself from Sabellianism. On the other hand, he maintained the divine unity by affirming their consubstantiality, especially that of the Father and the Son. If, like other Nicene fathers, he sometimes attributed the generation of the Son

1 *Ibid.* — 2 *De Trinitate*, I, 13. — 3 *Ibid.*, XII, 19.

4 *In simplicitate itaque fides est, in fide iustitia est, in confessione pietas est. A'w per difficiles nos Deus ad beatam vitam questiones vocat.* *Ibid.*, X, 70.

Ibid., X, 70. — 5 *Ibid.*, Vili, i.

6 *Qui enim pie infinita persequitur, etsi non pertingat aliquando, tamen proficiat.* *Ibid.*, II, 10.

7 See Le Bachellet, *op. cit.*, 2419-2426.

to the *Will* of the Father,* it was only to exclude all idea of coercion from God, He also understood the text, "*Pater maior est me*" of Christ, even as God², not in the sense of a real and essential subordination, but as marking in the Father a pre-eminence of a relative nature, based on His character of principle with regard to the Son. A very characteristic expression of Saint Hilary's ideas is the following : the Father and the Son "*unum sunt, non unione personae sed substantiae unitatei*". "*Unio*" is always used for the Persons, and "*unitas*" for the Nature.

A number of difficulties have arisen out of the *De Synodis*. "It has been averred that Hilary took ὁμοούσιον in the sense of ὁμοιοῦσιον, and the substantial unity of the Father and the Son as a purely specific unity. This is an error... Hilary certainly mixed with the Homoiousian party and did not fear to aid them against the Anomoeans; in the interests of peace and in order to win them over, he endeavoured to give a benignant interpretation to their formulas of faith, and show that they were lacking in logic more than in truth; but there was nothing hesitant about his own conclusions. In his opinion, the ὁμοιοῦσιον, may be admitted in all its rigour since the perfect resemblance in God implies the unity of substance; nevertheless this formula lends itself to ambiguous interpretation. It were better to employ the Nicene formula, which brings out with greater clarity the substantial unity of the Father and the Son"⁴.

Saint Hilary's conception of the Trinity implies the divinity of the Holy Ghost, although the Bishop, probably with the intention of sparing the Homoiousians, does not expressly give Him the name of God. On the other hand, both the Father and the Son are often termed *Spiritus Sanctus*. This should cause no surprise, says Saint Hilary⁵ (*in quo nihil scrupuli est*), since the two terms, *spirit* and *holy*, are fittingly applied to each of the Three Persons, but more especially to the third. With regard to the manner of origin, Hilary retains the Eastern expression *a Patre per Filium*, by which he does not mean that the Son is a mere intermediary, but that the Son, as distinct from the Father, should not be conceived as the principle from which the Holy Ghost proceeds. He wonders if *to receive from the Son* does not mean *to proceed from the Son*, but he dare not use this expression which is not found in the Scriptures. He nevertheless affirms this when he says : *Patre et Filio auctoribus confitendus est*.

* *De Trinit.*, III, 4. — 3 *Ibid.*, ix, 54. — ' *Ibid.*, IV, 42.

* J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogai.*, π, 262-263. Ὁ Ἁ6 Trinitarian teaching of Hilary *De Synodis*, see G. Rasneur, *op. cit.*, p. 411-426. — *De Trinit.*, II, 30.

6 *Ibid.*, II, 29. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, 269-273.

C) The misuse which has been made of certain vigorous expressions by which the saint insisted on various attributes of Christ has led to many exaggerated criticisms of his Christology. Since he frequently affirms that the Word put off the *form of God* in order to become man, it has been concluded that he meant that the Word had really lost the Divine Nature. But the "Kenosis" (ἐκένωσεν εαυτὸν, *evacuavit, exinanivit semetipsum*) must be taken as referring only to His glory and not to His divinity¹. In other passages he seems to exalt unduly Christ's human nature; but when he says *cælesie corpus* he means that the body of Christ was formed in Mary by the power of the Holy Ghost, and that it is the body of God³. Saint Hilary insisted to such an extent on some of the *extraordinary privileges* with which the human nature of Christ is endowed that he was accused, if not of Docetism, at least of Aphthartodocetism.

He was not, however, a Docetist, for he admitted the *reality of Christ's humanity*. It may be asked nevertheless whether he did not think of the Saviour as impassible, as impervious to pain. While very many passages in his works affirm that Christ has suffered, there are also many others, no less explicit, which bear a contrary meaning. The question is treated more especially in book X of the *De Trinitate*. This difficulty cannot be satisfactorily answered by saying that Saint Hilary speaks of Christ sometimes as God and sometimes as man; neither does it suffice to say that Christ, although exempt *de jure* from pain, accepted suffering voluntarily. But there is more than that⁴. Hilary, while recognising that organic, *physical pain* could exist in Christ, (*passio*) denied that He was sensible to any interior reaction, any feeling of pain (*sensus doloris*) which he counted unworthy of the Man-God. In this he was perhaps influenced by some particular, perhaps Stoic, *philosophical* conception, or, as is more likely, he was endeavouring to refute the *Arians*, who held that since Christ had suffered He could not be God, for God is impassible. Hilary went to the other extreme, and did not take sufficiently into account the degree of physical weakness to which Christ had desired to abase Himself⁵. But he was far from being altogether unaware of this and

¹ See in particular X. Le Bachelet, *op. cit.*, 2426-2449.

De Trinit., IX, 14; X, 7; XI, 18. — 3 *Ibid.*, X, 18.

⁴ *De Trinit.*, X, 14. — s X. Le Bachelet, *op. cit.*, 2448.

even explains that the infirmity of the Saviour is a sign of that divine power which triumphs by the Cross L

To sum up then : *Christ* is the centre of Saint Hilary's teaching; and in Christ he was chiefly attracted by the *divine attributes*, which he had meditated, understood and proclaimed. He was, as he himself says, a "disciple of the truth 2", Hence the ardent, passionate, love with which he always speaks of the Incarnate Word, whose divinity he defended and whose triumph he assured.

CHAPTER VI.

Saint Cyril of Jerusalem and various other authors.

Bibliography : See the notes for each author.

I. SAINT CYRIL OF JERUSALEM (313-386).¹

A) His life and the authority of his teaching.

I. Saint Cyril was born in or near Jerusalem about 313; he became a monk and made a deep study of the Scriptures, as may be seen by his writings. He was not ordained priest until 343 or 345, since the normal age for receiving this onici was thirty years. It was in 348 that he preached the celebrated "*Catecheses*". At this time he was certainly a priest and most probably had been raised to the episcopate in that same year. (The discovery of Saint Athanasius' Paschal letters

¹ *De Trinit.*, X, 48.

² In Christo itaque non mentior, quia *discipulus veritatis*, testis quoque nū|M veritatis. *Contra Const.*, 12. See what has been said above regarding llll firmness of his faith.

³ Special Bibliography : Editions: P. G., 33, 331-1180 (reproduction of l><m| Touttée's edit., 1720). French trans. : A. Faivre, *Œuvres complètes de SaitA Cyrille*, 2 vol., Lyon, 1844 (not very reliable). Studies: X. Le BaCHKI.kTJ *Cyrille de Jérusalem (saint)*, in *Did. thiol.*, 2527-257?. G. Delacroix, ΛαΑ *Cyrille de Jérusalem, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Paris, 1865. P. GONNET, *De sumA Cyrilli Hierosolymitani catechesibus*, Paris, 1876. G. Marquardt, 5. ÇyriM *Hieros. de contentionibus et placitis arianorum sententia*, Bransberg, 1S8Ī A. Cyrillus Hier, baptismi, chrismatis, eucharistia mysteriorum interfi'A Leipzig, 1882. J. Mader, *Der heil. Cyrillus, B. v. Jerus.*, in *seinem lebM und seinen Schriften*, Einsiedeln, 1891. J. Lebon, *S. Cyrille de Jérusalem (L Varianisme*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1924, p. 181-210; 357-386.

has enabled the date of the Council of Sardica to be fixed in the year 343 instead of 347, and therefore Athanasius' return to Alexandria in October 346 : on his way he had passed through Palestine where Saint Maximus, Bishop of Jerusalem entered into communion with him). Saint Cyril's consecration as a bishop gave rise to a number of calumnies which at a later date Saint Jerome helped to spread; but these were contradicted by the Eastern bishops assembled at Constantinople (382), who assured Pope Damasus that Cyril was canonically ordained by the bishops of his province.

A fact dating from the beginning of his episcopate may be mentioned here. In a letter to the Emperor Constantius, Saint Hilary narrates that he witnessed a luminous cross which appeared in the sky on the 7th May 351. This letter is still extant and also alludes to the finding of the True Cross under Constantine (The authenticity of this letter is hotly contested, or at least the latter part in which is found the word *ἁμοούσιο*, nowhere else used by Saint Cyril.

Cyril had been bishop for but a short time when he found himself in dispute with Acacius of Caesarea regarding the interpretation of the 7th canon of the Council of Nicaea which had attributed to Jerusalem, a suffragan diocese of Caesarea, a precedence of honour, without prejudice to the dignity of the Metropolitan See. This juridical dispute soon degenerated into a doctrinal quarrel, since Acacius rejected all the Nicene findings and Cyril maintained them all in spite of his dislike of the word *ἁμοούσιο*. Finally Acacius had Cyril condemned by a synod and he was banished in 357 or 358. This exile was destined to last until Constantius' death, except for the few months separating the Synod of Seleucia (Sept. 359) from that of Constantinople (beginning of 360) in which latter Acacius, having become the leader of the Homoeans, registered a definite triumph over both the Homoeians and Saint Cyril who had determinedly opposed the strict Arians.

He returned in Julian's reign and witnessed the failure of the apostate Emperor's attempt to rebuild the Temple.²³*

¹ P. G.² 33, 1165-1176. This letter, however, contains no information regarding the *circumstances* of the finding of the true Cross, while the fact that it was found is indirectly attested in the Catecheses (4-10-13) which mention the already widespread diffusion of the relics of the True Cross.

² Cyril himself had foretold the failure of this undertaking. Socrates, *Hist.* 20; Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, 1, 37.

Later, under Valens, he again underwent eleven years of exile (367-378) of which nothing is known. On his return he found his diocese ravaged by heresy. In 381 he assisted at the Council of Constantinople, and also perhaps at the supplementary assembly held the following year, from which the bishops wrote to Damasus expressing their great esteem for Cyril: "We would have you know also that the Bishop of Jerusalem, that mother of all the Churches, is the reverend and wellbeloved of God, Cyril, formerly canonically ordained by the bishops of his province, and who has waged in various places many combats with the Arians", Saint Cyril died in 386 at the age of 70 or 72 years. He was declared a Doctor in 1882.

2. Saint Cyril's orthodoxy as regards the Trinity has sometimes been called in question I. His connection with the Homoiousians caused him to be suspected of Arianism. There is no doubt that he adhered to various groups, but it is less sure that his faith ever varied, in spite of Rufinus' remark: *aliquando in fide, sæpius in confessione variabat*. It would seem that at first he desired to remain neutral. It cannot be proved that he ever opposed the Nicene faith. I!K did not act otherwise than Saint Hilary when he supported the Homoiousians against the Homoeans. If the word $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$ is not found in the Catecheses it is because it did not enter into the scope of such a work. Harnack himself declared 3; "The word $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron$ alone is lacking; in reality Cyril is orthodox" 4. Moreover, it must be admitted that he had but very little doctrinal influence in the Trinitarian controversies, for neither as a thinker nor as a writer did he show much originality.

It is not chiefly as a Doctor of the Trinity that he is honoured by posterity, but as a *witness to the traditional faith*. His great work, the Catecheses, is neither a controversial writing nor a speculative treatise, but a simple, popular exposition of the faith. From this point of view his work stands in the first class, as even the Protestants admit,

* See Le Bachelet, *op. cit.*, col 2532-2533, 2575-2576.

3 Rufinus, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 23. St. Jerome (*Chronicle*, 2nd year of Constantius, P. L., 271, 684) treats Cyril unreservedly as an Arian.

3 *Lehrbuch tier Dogmengeschichte* (4th edit.), II, 249.

4 J. Lbbon, who has recently treated this subject, came to the same conclusion) Cyril varied in his ecclesiastical adhesions, but no wise in his faith. *Op. cit.*, see the *Conclusion*, p. 383-386.

since they have been obliged to resort to the basest shuffling in order to destroy his testimony.

B) The Catecheses and their sacramental teaching.

Apart from the Catecheses* the *works of Saint Cyril* consist only of the *letter* to Constantius in 351 (mentioned above), a *sermon* on the Pool of Bethesda² and *fragments* ³ of other sermons.

I. The Catecheses or catechetical lectures contain 24 instructions, numbered I to 23, preceded by an introduction or *procatechesis* stressing the importance of the act for which the auditors are about to prepare themselves ⁴. *Catecheses* i-18 are said to be *ad illuminandos* (Κατηχήσει φωτιζόμενων) addressed, that is to say, to the catechumens preparing for baptism. They were preached during Lent 348. The *last five*, numbers 19-23, were preached to the same persons after baptism, during Easter week, and are therefore called *mystagogical* instructions (from μύστη, initiate) ⁵. These latter deal exclusively with the three Sacraments (or mysteries) of baptism, confirmation and the Eucharist, and provide a supplement to the instructions already given in the first three catecheses *ad illuminandos* on baptism and penance ⁶. Most of the former (4-18) contain a methodical explanation of *the Creed*, which is found in an abridged form ⁷ in the fourth instruction, and explained article by article in the following instructions ⁸. The doctrinal teaching is terminated by a moral exhortation. The author's chief aim is to teach, but he also warns his hearers against the many enemies of their faith—Pagans, Jews, Samaritans, heretics (Manichaeans, Marcellus of Ancyra).

The Creed explained by Saint Cyril is that of the Church of Jerusalem, which, although it was drawn up before the

¹ *I. G.*, 33, 331-1128. — * *P. G.*, 33, 1131-1156.

² *P. G.*, 33, 1181-1182. — « *P. G.*, 33, 331-366.

The critic Th. Schermann's doubts of the authenticity of the *mystagogical catecheses* are not based on serious grounds; he attributed them to John of Jerusalem. See *Theologische Revue*, 1911, and below, p. 495.

³ The first is entitled *illuminandorum introductio*: the second deals with penance and the third with baptism. *P. G.* 33, 369-450.

Entitled *De decem dogmatibus*: *P. G.*, 33, 453-504.

⁸ The fifth deals with *De Fide et symbolo*; the next four on the Christian I. itching *De Deo uno* (6), *De Patre* (7), *De providentia Dei* (8) *De Deo Creatore* (9); five others (10-15) treat of the *Son*, two of the *Holy Ghost* (16-17), and one (18) of the *Resurrection*, the *Church* and *eternal life*. *P. G.*, 33, 504-1060.

Nicene Creed, is nevertheless more complete, since the latter ends abruptly with: *et in Spiritum Sanctum*. It therefore holds a middle place between the Apostles' Creed (Roman) and the Nicene Creed. A fairly widespread opinion holds that the Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Creed is no other than the Creed of Jerusalem, which at this period clearly expressed the Nicene faith and contained the formulas against the Pneumatomachi. Many think that much of it was composed by Saint Cyril himself, while others attribute it to Saint Epiphanius.

2. There is no need to insist on the not very outstanding Trinitarian or Christological teaching of the Catecheses. Of greater importance is the information on the Sacraments. Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist are explained and studied in detail.

a) Baptism which is preceded by anointing with exorcised oil, has as its effects: 1) the forgiveness of sin; 2) the sanctification of the soul (illumination, deification, assimilation to Christ and the inhabitation of the Holy Ghost); 3) the impression of a character, an indelible seal.

b) Confirmation is certainly meant by the anointing of the newly-baptised person with chrism immediately after baptism; it is a rite quite distinct from baptism, having its own special effects: 1) a more perfect assimilation to Jesus Christ; Christians thus become true christs (χριστοί, anointed 3), not only by the external unction, but also by an interior one, consisting of a new communion with the Holy Ghost Who invests them with His Power as with a coat of armour (πανοπλία 4); 2) the impression of a new character, obviously different from that of baptism.

c) The Blessed Sacrament is studied in the 22nd and the 23rd catecheses 5, which, as Le Bachelet remarks, probably contain the clearest and most important teaching on this subject in the early Church. The *Real Presence* is unreservedly affirmed. By receiving Holy Communion we partake of the Body and Blood of Christ, σύσσωμοι (concorporei) καὶ σύνναιμοι (consanguinei) τοῦ Χριστοῦ; we become Christ-

1 Catecheses 3, and 19-20 (Myst. 1, 2; P. G., 33, 1065-1084).

5 Catech. 21 (Myst. 3, De sacro chrismate; P. G., 33, 1087-1094).

3 Ibid., I. — 4 Ἐνδεδυμένο- τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος . Ibid., 4.

5 Mystagorica! 4 and 5; D. G., 33, 1097-1106; 1109-1128.

bearers (χριστοφόροι »). The twenty-third or last catechesis deals with the meaning and the symbolism of the various ceremonies *of the Mass*: the washing of the hands, the kiss of peace, the Preface, preceded by the *Sursum Corda* and followed by the *Sanctus*, the epiclesis, the great intercession, the prayer for the living and the dead; the *Pater Noster* (all of which is explained); the *Sancta Sanctis* (invitation to Communion); and lastly the Communion in the two kinds¹. In spite of the lack of certain details, this short account of the Mass in the Church of Jerusalem in the fourth century is, together with the details supplied by Saint Justin, the richest *liturgical* document of the early Church. It provides, from a doctrinal point of view, a most explicit affirmation of the *Sacrifice* of the Mass³.

These brief notes suffice to show, despite its apparent simplicity, the real value of Saint Cyril's work. It justifies the title of Doctor of the Church which Leo XIII conferred on him.

II. DIVERS OTHER AUTHORS.—OPPONENTS OF MANICHAËISM.

1. Hegemonius is the author of the *Acts of the dispute of Archelaus with Manes*. These Acts are in the form of a detailed report of a discussion which was supposed to have taken place between a bishop of Mesopotamia and the founder of Manichaeism, and which terminates in the victory of the bishop. All this is pure invention. Not one of the characters mentioned, except Manes, is known to history. The writing, which for a long time was attributed to Archelaus, is rather the work of one Hegemonius, who composed it between 325 and 348, and of whom nothing else is known. This author probably lived in Syria and wrote his book in Greek. A Latin translation alone is extant. It is a valuable document for the history of Manichaeism.

2. Alexander of Lycopolis wrote another refutation of Manichaeism⁵ at the beginning of the fourth century. Photius says he was a bishop of Lycopolis (Egypt). But since Tillemont, it is thought that he was neither a bishop nor even a Christian, but a Pagan of the Neo-Platonic School. The work is very short but should be referred to for the history and refutation of Manichaeism.

¹ *Caiech.*, 22.

³ This Catechesis is translated in *Le dogme catholique dans les Pères de l'Eglise*, la F. AMANN, p. 153-162.

⁵ For the doctrine of the *Redemption* by the Sacrifice of the Cross in Saint Cyril, see J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, p. 166-170.

⁴ *P. C.*, 10, 1105-1528. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, in, 265-269.

De placitis Manichaeorum, P. G., 18, 411-448. See O. Bardenhewer, *ibid.*, 102.

3. Titus of Bostra, Bishop of that town, who died under Valent, also composed a treatise in four books against the Manichaeans. The entire text is extant in Syriac and a part of it in Greek. The first two books reject Manichaeism in the name of dialectics and philosophy, while the others base the refutation on theology and the Scriptures. The most valuable part of the work is the quotations from Manichaean writings. Fragments of a commentary on Saint Luke, also by Titus, together with a sermon on the Epiphany, are also extant³*

4. Serapion of Thmuis³, a friend of Saint Anthony and Saint Athanasius, was Bishop of Thmuis (district of Alexandria) from before 339 and died after 362. His learning earned him the name of *Scholastic*⁴. One of his works, *Against the Manichaeans*, mentioned by Saint Jerome, is extant. This work, which for a long period was preserved only in part, has been restored to its original form since 1894. Bardenhewer remarks that this writing is really valuable. Therein, in order to undermine the fundamental dogmas of the Manichaeans, the author displays not only an astonishing amount of energy but also a great deal of shrewd wit⁵. Another of Serapion's treatises *On the titles of the Psalms* is lost, as well as his *correspondence* with the exception of two letters recently discovered. Interest has recently been attracted to Serapion by the discovery of an *Euchologion* or *Sacramentary* bearing his name.

The *Sacramentarium Serapionis*, discovered in 1894⁶ at Mount Athos, is a kind of ritual or pontifical, containing thirty prayers, some of which are attributed by name to Serapion of Thmuis; and even should the others be prior to him, he is undoubtedly the author of the collection. That this work is of capital interest may be seen from the following outline of its contents.

Three parts, or three groups of prayers, may be distinguished: *a*) prayers I-VI relate to the Mass; *b*) prayers VII-XVIII are chiefly concerned with Sacramental rites; *c*) prayers XIX-XXX also refer to the Mass.

These last twelve (xix-xxx), which are found at the end of the collection, probably on account of their lesser importance, should logically have been placed at the beginning

¹ P. G., 18, 1069-1264 (bk. I—bk. vi, as far as ch. vii). Complete text in Ditt Lagarde's edition, Berlin, 1859. The sermon *In ramos palmarum* (P. G., 1263-1278) is probably apocryphal. For Titus see O. Bardenhewer, *2M/I* 269-273.

² P. G., 162. In the Latin edit., 80, 757-816.

³ P. G., 40, 899-942. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, in, 98-102.

⁴ *Ob elegantiam ingenii cognomen Scholastici meruit: Jerome, De Viris*, 99. I

⁵ O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, II, 61.

⁶ First important edition by G. Wobbermin in *Text. u. linters.*, xviii Leipzig, 1899. Other edit. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apost.*, in Paderborn, 1905. See Mgr Batiffol's study, *Une découverte liturgique*, in *Bull. Utt. Eccl.*, 1899, 69, 81.

⁷ They are so placed in Funk's edition.

since they contain liturgical elements of the first part of the Sunday synaxis "before the offering". At present the collection opens with the *anaphora* (prayer of the offering or canon of the Mass), which is the most valuable document of all (I). Then follow five other fairly short prayers of the Mass; the last is the blessing of the congregation before they depart (vi), preceded by a blessing for oil and water, which served as a kind of "sacramental" for private use.

The twelve prayers (vn-XVIII), which compose the *second part* of the collection, are for the most part designed for a properly *sacramental* use; five of them are blessings used in the administration of baptism (vil-xi); the three following are prayers for the laying on of hands on deacons, priests and bishops (xil-xiv); three others (xv-xvii) are formulas for the blessing of oil: the first two belong to the liturgy of baptism and confirmation¹, but the third (xvil) is a solemn blessing of the oil for the sick (*in oleum ægrotorum*), and should be distinguished from the blessing for the oil mentioned above; theologians rightly regard this as an obvious allusion to Extreme Unction². The prayer for the burial of the dead, says Mgr Batiffol, "is finely written; it is a personal prayer for the dead, composed in the spirit of all ecclesiastical tradition"³.

It is evident that in many ways the *Euchologion of Serapion* is worthy of being classed with Saint Cyril's *Catecheses*.

III. ANONYMOUS DISCIPLINARY WRITINGS.

In this place will be mentioned a certain number of *anonymous* writings, dating for the most part from the fourth century, and referring to *discipline* and even *liturgy*, so that they may be compared with the *Catecheses* or the *Euchologion*. They are found in two forms, the former consists of *collections of canons*, while the latter is made up of *immense ampliations*.

A). Collections of canons. Some degree of light has been shed on this matter by Dom Connolly's thesis, attributing to Hippolytus the *Apostolic Tradition*⁴ on which so many

¹ Thus Funk, after Brightman, places one of them (xv) after the third baptismal blessing, and the other (xvi) after the fifth baptismal blessing, before the prayers for the ordinations.

² See C. Ruch, *EE* *Extreme Unction*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1945-1951.

³ I. Batiffol, *of. cit.*, *Ttyz.* — * See above p. 223.

of these works are based. A distinction will be made held between the collections which have the *Tradition* as their source, and those which are independent.

1. The following derive from Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*:

a) The 38 Canons of Hippolytus (divided into 261 paragraphs; extant in Arabic and Ethiopian). These are certainly posterior to Hippolytus, but depend almost directly on his work¹.

β) The Epitome' (purporting to be a *synopsis* of the sixth book of the "Apostolic Constitutions"), also called *Constitutiones per Hippolytum*, is another version of the Apostolic Tradition.

c) The VIIth book of the "Apostolic Constitutions" is also in a great measure a much later revision of Hippolytus' original work. See below.

δ) Lastly, the Testament of Our Lord² is still another and fieri version of the same writing, with new matter introduced. It was incorporated in the *Octateuch* of Clement, which will be studied below³

2. Several other collections of Canons, *independent of Hippolytus' work*, are extant. The better known are:

α) The Ecclesiastical Canons, preserved, like the Apostolic Tradition, and often together with it in the same collection, in Coptic and Arabic. They contain, in addition to moral precepts similar to those of the *Didache*, a number of ritual and disciplinary instructions on the ordinations. They purport to be a work of the Apostles; thus each canon is introduced by the formula: Peter says.... John says. They were composed between 299 and 400.

β) The Apostolic Canons⁴, in Greek, to the number of 84 or 85. They are rendered particularly important by the fact that Dionysius Exiguus translated into Latin, about 500, the first 40 or 50, which were finally embodied in the *Corpus Juris*. The others were not known in the West until the sixteenth century. In the East, on the contrary, they were all adopted by the Council of Trullo (692), and considerably aggravated the doctrinal differences which already divided the Greek from the Latin Church, since many of these canons were based on

* Edited by D. B. Von Haneberg, Munich, 1870. Latin translation in Mgr Duchesne's *Origines du Culte chrétien*, (5th ed., p. 531-549, as an appendix.)

* Edited in F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, Paderborn-1905. — 3 Edit. Rakmani, *Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi*, Mainz, 1899.

4 It would seem that all these collections are spread out over the 3rd, 4th, and 5th centuries in the order given; but it is impossible to give more precise information as to the date of their composition. As for the general nature of their contents, the reader should refer either to what has been said on the *Apost. Tradition*, or to the *Apostolic Constitutions* (see below).

5 Edit. Funk, *Doctrina duodecim apostolorum*, Tübingen, 1887. It was Hill author who gave them the above name. They are also called the *Egyptian Church Ordinance*, or *apostolische kirchenordnung* (Bickel), 1843.

6 The latest and best edition is Funk's, *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, Paderborn, 1905, I, p. 564-595.

B). The Great Canonical Compilations. Various compilations of this kind were composed in the fourth and fifth centuries. The most important is undoubtedly the *Apostolic Constitutions*. It purports to be the work of Saint Clement of Rome, but although it also contains eight books, it should not be confused with the *Octateuch of Clement*, which, however, resembles it in many ways.

Books I-VI are no more than a revision of the *Didascalia* 3.

Neither is book VIII an original work. It also may be divided into two parts: the first (ch. 1-26) is chiefly concerned with ritual, and the second (27-47) with discipline. The *first part* opens with a little introduction on the *charismata*, of which the purpose is explained; it deals

Λειτουργία των ἁγίων ἀποστόλων διὰ Κλήμεντο ... ἡ καθολικὴ διδασκαλία.
In *J. Gr.*, I, 555-D56 (Cotblier's edit. 1672, revised by Galliano in 1767).
See preferably F. X. Funk, *Didascalia d Constitutiones apostolorum*, 2, vol.,
I derborn, 1905. Studies: F. X. Funk, *Die apostolischen constitutionen*,
Rittenburg, 1891. F. Nau, *Constitutions apostoliques*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1520-
1537. H. Leclercq, *Constitutions apostoliques* in *Did. arch.*, col. 2732-2748
(bibliography, 2742-2748).

¹ See above p. 287 ; F. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 1523-1526.

¹ See above p. 43-51 ; F. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 1526-1529.

This is a valuable document, since the anachronisms it contains prove the apocryphal nature of the work.

for the most part with the *ordination* of bishops (3-5) (and here the author gives a liturgy of the Mass, ch. 5-15), the ordination of priests (16) and deacons (17-18), deaconesses (19-20), subdeacons (21) and lectore (22); then follow the qualifications (23-26) for confessors, virgins, widow, and exorcists, "who have no ordination", A) The *second part* (27-47), purporting to be a supplement to the preceding part, contains, in no apparent order, various prescriptions relating to bishops, the clergy, public worship, feast days, ecclesiastical property, etc., and is completed (47) in many editions *by the 85 *Apostolic canons* studied above.

As may be seen, the Apostolic Constitutions are in no way an original work; the author did no more than adapt ancient rites and disciplinary rulings to the customs of his own times. Even the second part of book vu and of book vm, of which the source is not known, are taken from some other work. The essentials of the first part of book vm are drawn from the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, although it has been greatly revised in parts and augmented by the *liturgy of the Mass*.

This liturgy, which occupies chapters 5-15 of book vm, is, together with the portions of book vu (ch. 42-44) dealing with ritual, the most important part of the work from our point of view, since it completes our knowledge of certain rites in the fourth and fifth centuries. The Mass described therein is the Syriac Mass about the year 400.

The work must have been compiled at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, in the neighbourhood of Antioch, by a single author with (to judge by the nature of the interpolations) semi Arian or Apollinarian leanings. In spite of its errors, the early Father, did not hesitate to attribute it to Clement and through him to the Apostles; the errors were explained away as heretical interpolations. It was for this reason that the work was condemned by the *Trullan Council* (692) in its second canon, which retained only the 85 apostolic canons. Before the Renaissance the Constitutions were unknown to the West.

2. The writing bearing the name of the Octateuch of Clement extant in Syriac, Arabic and Coptic, is no other than a particular form, in eight books, of the contents of the ninth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* from which it derives. A synopsis may be found in the work of Mgr. Rahmani '.

1 In many manuscripts this last number is not found.

* See H. Leclercq, *Constitutions apostoliques (Liturgie des)*, in *Diet, arch.*, col. 2748-2749.

3 Fl Na u, *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clement traduite en français* H Paris, 1913.

* These are the contents as set out by the author :

Bk. I-II : *Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ*; see above.

Bk. in : *The Ecclesiastical Canons*; see above.

Bk. IV : *The charismata* : Apost. Const. vm, 1-2.

Bk. V : *Ordinations* : A. C., vm, 3-26 (except the liturgy, 5-15).

Bk. VI : *Statutes of the clergy and the laity* : A. C., VIII, 27-34 (except 29) and 42-46.

Bk. VII : *The mystical ministry* : A. C., Vili, 29 and 5 (end).

Bk. vili : *Canons of the Apostles* : A. C., VIII, 47.

This compilation appears to have been made during the fifth century.

CHAPTER VII.

Saint Ephraem and Syriac literature
in the fourth century.

Special Bibliography : see the note for each author.

I. SYRIAC LITERATURE BEFORE SAINT EPHRAEM.

Like Greek literature, in the East, Syriac literature also had its hour of brilliance in the fourth century. It is important to know something of the writers who illustrated it since the Church of Syria², after the fifth century, was plunged by its doctors into *Nestorianism* and *Monophysitism*; after the seventh century, cut off from the rest of Christendom by the Arab conquest, it retained but a very diminished intellectual influence. For our purpose then, Syriac letters may be said to be at their *zenith* in the fourth century. Saint Ephraem especially renders this period remarkable, but a number of other authors, who came either before or after him, may also be mentioned with profit.

A) Authors who wrote previous to the fourth century.

I. Tatian, Saint Justin's impetuous disciple, is one of the first known Syrian writers. His *Diatessaron* was very soon translated into Syriac, if it was not, as some think, originally composed in that tongue⁴. It was embodied in the liturgy, and commented, until it was forbidden in the fifth century by the Orthodox bishops, Rabulas and Theodoret of Cyrus in particular.

² For Syriac literature see, besides J. S. ÀSSEMANI (mentioned on p. 16), Rhébens Duval, *La littérature syriaque* (Coll. *Bibl. Enseign. Hist. Eccl.*), l'Iris, 1899; J. Labourt, *Le christianisme dans l'empire Perse*, Paris, 1904. The most important and recent collections of Syriac texts are : *Patrologia syriaca* mid *Patrologia orientalis*, mentioned at the beginning of the General Bibliography.

³ Syria, comprising in a wide sense all *Syriac speaking* countries, spreads from du Mediterranean to the plateau of Iran. It may be divided into a) Western KIA, having *Antioch* as its metropolis in the North; b) Middle Syria or Oirhoene on the Upper Euphrates, having Edessa as its central point; c) Eastern Syria, reaching from the region of the Upper Tigris, with *Mosul* mid *Nisibis* as centres, as far as the Lower Tigris towards Babylonia, with a capit-ili *Srleucia-Ctesiphon* to the south of Bagdad.

⁴ See above p. 130-131.

⁵ See R. Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 44 sq.

2. Bardesanea ' (i 54-222), the greatest Syriac writer of the third century, was not very orthodox. Nevertheless F. Nau does not think that he should be classed as a Gnostic. He may have been one, but he was converted to Christianity, retaining, it is true, some of his early errors. He was first and foremost a philosopher. His great work, "*Book of the Laws of the Countries*", is a work of transition between Chaldaean Paganism and Christianity'. All his philosophy must have possessed this character. He was in advance of his time when, after his conversion in the second century, he affirmed, at Edessa, the existence of free will in man, and the oneness and all-powerfulness of God; he was wrong, however, when teaching that the body was subject to control by the stars he was led to deny the resurrection and to the impossibility of identifying this servile body with the immortal body of the Saviour. His disciples, far from softening down these exaggerations, only aggravated them'.

As Nau also says, the school of Bardesanes was a movement towards the sciences and natural philosophy. Then Saint Ephraem came and drew his contemporaries away from the contemplation of this world, bringing them back to the meditation of the Scriptures and the Christian mysteries*.

B) At the beginning of the fourth century.—Aphraates s (280?-345), surnamed "the Wise Man of Persia", sometimes confused with James of Nisibis (on account of the name of James, which he seems to have taken at his ordination), was first a monk, and then a bishop in Eastern Syria, perhaps at Mar-Mattai, to the north of Mosul. He has left a work containing 23 documents, called variously *Letters*, *Sermons*, *Discourses*, but usually *Demonstrations*.

Each document is numbered and begins with one of the letters of the Syriac alphabet in its correct order. They deal with moral and ascetical matters (faith, penance prayers, fasting...) or theological subjects (resurrection, divinity of Christ...); many of them, and especially the last, are written against the Jews and their practices (Sabbath, circumcision, the Pasch...). The first ten of these twenty-three Demonstrations were written in 336-337; the following twelve (11-22) in 343-344; and the last (23) in the month of August 345; it bears the title: *Concerning the great evil*. LXV, 8), referring to the small number of the just destined to save the people from entire destruction (The author wrote during the great persecution which marked the middle of the reign of Sapor II, the Great, 310-380).

* F. Nau, *Bardesane*, in *Diet, thiol.*, 391-398.

* F. Nau's edit, in *Bair. Syr.*, it. French translation in Langlois, *Collection des historiens de l'Arménie*, 1867.

3 F. Nau, *Bardesanites*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 398-401. — 4 *Ibid.*, col. 400-401.

5 Edition: *Pair, syr.*, I, 11, Paris, 1894, 1907. Studies: J. Forget, *De vita et scriptis Aphraatis*, Louvain, 1882. J. M. Chavanis, *Les lettres d'Afrat, le sage perse, étudiées au point de vue de l'histoire et de la doctrine*, Saint-Etienne, 1908. See also R. Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 225-229. J. Tixeront, *Hist. dogm.*, II, p. 202-209. T. Parisot, *Aphraate*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 1457-1463.

Aphraates represents for us the earliest witness to the faith in his country. Hence the interest of his work, although from a theological standpoint it is very poor when compared with that of his Latin or Greek contemporaries. "The *Wise Man of Persia*", says Tixeront, "living far removed from controversial centres, endeavoured above all to live his faith and to make it live about him, while, from a speculative point of view, he was content to classify as best he could the teaching of the Scriptures, explaining it by means of the scanty knowledge he had received from a feeble tradition" *.

He admits that Jesus Christ is God, the Son of God (*Deus de Deo*) and this is proved throughout Demonstration XVII chiefly by means of arguments *ad hominem* against the Jews. Similarly, he recognises the divine attributes of the Holy Ghost. His doctrine, in brief, is no other than that of Nicaea, in spite of his imperfect terminology.

The Church, founded by Christ, rests on Peter (*Dem.* VII, 5), who is *prince of pastors* and to whom is confided the flock (*Dem.* X, 4), "the faithful witness placed in the midst of the nations" (*Dem.* XI, 12). James and John are the columns of the Church, but Peter is the *foundation* (*Dem.* XXIII, 12) and the Church embraces all peoples.

The Sacraments are not treated *expresse* by Aphraates: nevertheless he mentions nearly all of them.

Baptism, the Eucharist, and Penance are often cited. The latter³ implies the avowal of sin by the penitent, and in the minister, who is compared to a doctor, the power of healing by virtue of the "power of the keys"; a power which pertains to the priesthood and not only to the monks. The power of Order is conferred on bishops, priests and deacons, the three degrees of the hierarchy³, by the laying on of hands. Aphraates gives various mystical meanings for the anointings with the *blessed oil*⁴. Some of these certainly refer to *Baptism*, and Confirmation (imposition of the sign)⁵, and also probably to Extreme Unction, called the anointing of the sick. He also mentions an *anointing of penitents*, which is probably only a "sacramental", unless it concerns the reconciliation of heretics, which is performed by again conferring confirmation.

The most archaic portion of Aphraates' theology is his Eschatology. He teaches the doctrine of the *sleep of the soul* which was adopted by nearly all the Syrian Nestorians: in the interval which separates the moment of death from the resurrection of the body the soul remains in a state of insensibility, but according as the soul is just or sinful, it is already rendered happy or unhappy, by joyful or sad dreams.

* J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, p. 209. — ³ Penance is treated in *Dem.* vit. *Dem.* XIV, 1. — ⁴ *Dem.*, xxm, 3. — ⁵ *Dem.*, XII, 13.

He admits, however, without hesitation, the eternity of Heaven and Hell *

II. SAINT EPHRAEM†* (306?-373).

A) Life and character of Saint Ephraem.

Very little is known of *Saint Ephraen's* life, and in the various existing biographies it is not easy to differentiate between legend and history. He was born about 306 at Nisibis (North-west of Mosul, Mesopotamia). F. Nau says it is certain that "he was of humble origin, that he was turned from home by his father, probably at the time of his conversion, that he acted as a servant, and then followed James of Nisibis"³. According to Bardenhewer⁴, however, his parents were Christians and brought him up in the fear of God. He resolved to give his whole life in the service of God; began to live as a hermit and spent his whole time in study and contemplation. Very soon, however, Bishop James of Nisibis (d. 338) began to take an interest in him and perhaps took him with him to Nicaea. Later, he probably placed him at the head of a school in the episcopal town. Ephraem was then a deacon, and probably remained in this order all his life. While at Nisibis, the country was invaded on several occasions by the Persians, and the Syrian biographers attribute the defeat of Sapor II in 338 to his prayers. The town was again besieged in 346 and 350; both this siege and the hardships which Nisibis underwent in the

¹ *Dem.* XX, 12.

- Editions : His works are spread through five principal collections :

1. J. AND Ev. Assemani, *Opera omnia, graece, latine, syriace*, Rome, 1733' 1746, six volumes in two series: Syriac writings, i-m ; Greek writings, 1-111.
2. J. Overbeck, 5. *Ephrami syri, Rabula... opera selecta*, Oxford, 1865.
3. G. Bickell, *Ephram syri carmina uisibena*, Leipzig, 1886.
4. J. Lamy, O'. *Ephram syri Hymni et sermones*, 4 vol., Malines, 1882-1904,
5. S. J. Mercati, *S. Ephram syri opera*, Rome, 1915 (1st part).

Studies: J. Lamy, *Saint Ephram*, in the *Université catholique*, 1890, t. nt (p. 321-349), t. IV (p. 161-190). C. Eir ainer, *Der hl. Ephram der Syrer, rMÀ dogmengeschichtliche Abhandlung*, Kempten, 1889. E. Emereau, *S. EphreA le syrien, son auvre littéraire grecque*, Paris, 1918. See also J. TIXEROS li *Hist. dogm.*, π, p. 209-221. Rubens Duval, *l.« littérature syriaque*, l'uri- 1899, P. 33'-338. F. Nau, *Ephrem (Saint)*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 18819. E. Le Camus, *Ephrem (Saint)* in *Did. Bibl.*, col. 1889-1891. C. Ferii- A. *Ephrem poète*, Paris, 1877. Fessler-Jungmann, *op. cit.*, II, p. 10 .|M O. Bardf-nhewer, *Geschichte*, IV, p. 342-373.

³ F. Nau, *op. cit.*, col. 189.

* O. Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, II, 260; *Geschichte*, iv, p. 351.

last war (359-363), which ended in Persian domination, are narrated in Ephraem's *carmina nisibena*. Most of the Christians fled before the invader.

Ephraem himself took refuge in Edessa (*Orfa*), capital of Osrhoene, near the Euphrates on Roman territory, where he spent the last ten years of his life (363-373). Most of his extant works date from this period. For the most part he lived the life of a hermit on a mountain near to the town. This did not prevent him from having disciples who came out to him or whom he visited in the town. It is possible that, together with other Doctors from Nisibis, he was one of the founders of the famous "School of Edessa" known by the name of the *School of the Persians*. It is hardly likely that he visited Egypt and its monastic institutions, and although it is possible it is by no means certain that he journeyed to Caesarea about 370 to see Saint Basil. He died in 373, probably on the 9th June¹.

A description of Ephraem has been left to us by his biographer. "From the time that he began to lead a monastic life his death he ate nothing but barley bread and dried herbs, sometimes varied by green herbs. He drank nothing but water; his flesh had dried up on his bones until it resembled baked clay. His clothing was a mass of patches, of the colour of mud. He was small of stature; his lace was always grave, for he never laughed; he was bald and wore no beard". But this austere and unprepossessing exterior hid a mystic's ardent soul².

Saint Ephraem was a contemplative, but while others are led by a deep knowledge of God and of divine things, either to study Him in learned books or to serve Him actively in works of charity or penance, Ephraem chose to sing to Him. Alone among the Doctors of the Church he stands out as the bard of the divine mysteries. He had, of course, his struggles with heresy, but he fought more as an enthusiastic admirer, of the faith which pitilessly destroys those who deny it, than as a controversialist. He also had his didactic works, but again he taught his flock by song as a mother instructs her children with melodious rhymes. Nearly all Saint Ephraem's work is poetic, essentially *mystical* in nature, not much on account of its emotional content as on account

¹ De fontibus vita S. Ephrem Syri, in Lamy, *op. cit.*, iv (1902),
² XI.1. — 3 See J. Lamy on S. Ephraem's life. *op. cit.*, in, p. 335-349.

of the *qualities*; the elevation, the purity, the unceasing fluency, the religious inspiration it contains reveal that its emotion and its sentiments derive from a supernatural source, from "the living water springing up to eternal life" 1. These essential qualities obscure and attenuate that wordiness which he shares in common with others of his race.

Saint Ephraem's *imagination* painted in brilliant colours. But this gift, which is to be prized in the poet and even in the orator, can easily become a stumbling block for the *theologian*. And it is a fact that Ephraem's writings are wanting in *sound logic*, a quality so indispensable for the clear expression of ideas. Moreover, when engaged in the refutation of error or the explanation of a doctrine he is not as *precise* as one might wish. As J. Tixeront remarks, "he was capable of embellishing even controversy with flowers, but troubled very little about the problems raised by his Gnostic or Manichaean adversaries. As we shall see, he was perfectly happy in the unquestioned faith of the Church" 2. He was not therefore strictly a theologian, but a Doctor of unimpeachable orthodoxy. Benedict XV made him a Doctor of the Church in 1920.

B) The works of Saint Ephraem.

He has left a number of works both in *prose* and in *verse*.

I. The prose writings are all Biblical *commentaries*, with the exception of a few sermons. Saint Ephraem commented the whole Bible (save the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament) : the Old Testament on the text of the *Peshiti* and the New from the *Diatessaron*. Of this enormous work all that remains, in Syriac, is the commentary on Genesis, Exodus (as far as ch. XXXII, 26), and a few fragments ; and in Armenian the commentaries on the Gospels 3, the Epistles of Saint Paul and the Books of Paralipomenon. Ephraem employs in these commentaries a literal and historical *exegetical method* similar to that of the School of Antioch; but it is chiefly allegorical and mystical in his hymns and sermons.

1 See S. Gregory of Nyssa, 5. *Ephraem paraen.*, 19.

2 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* II, 210.

3 Edited by the Venetian Mechitarists in 1836; Latin trans., *Evangelii commentariorum Expositio* by J. B. Aucher and J. Mosinger, Venice, 1876. Two versions of the Diatessaron are still extant, one in Arabic and the other in Latin (the latter is in *P. L.*, 68, 251-358, attributed to Ammonias of Alexandria; translated by Victor of Capua).

2. The poetical writings are by far the most important part of his work. He is, before all, a Christian poet, *the precatpoet of Syria*.

Syriac poetry, purely ecclesiastical, was written especially by the clergy both for spreading Christian teaching and giving greater solemnity to the ceremonies of the Church * The basic principle of the metre is the fixed number of syllables used in each verse, while quantity is neglected. The verses are grouped two by two to form a metrical phrase in imitation of Hebrew *parallelism*. In the hymns the verses are also arranged in groups of from four to twelve, to form strophes².

Syriac poetry may be divided into two classes : the poetical *sermons* or discourses (*Mîmrê*) and the hymns (*Madraschi*)³.

i. The sermons are metrical compositions which may be classed as epic or narrative verse. They were written especially for the feasts of the Church and were recited at the ceremonies, or used for spiritual reading. 2. The hymns, on the contrary, in spite of the title of instructions (*madraschi*) given them by the Syrians, were lyrical in style. It was chiefly by means of these that Bardesanes, the creator of Syriac poetry, spread his teaching. Later this example was followed and hymns were imposed to be sung in the churches in two choirs. These hymns were in three kinds : a) exhortations to virtue; b) panegyrics of the mysteries, or the saints; c) controversial compositions against Pagans and heretics.

Saint Ephraem wrote in both these forms, and although he was not the founder of this poetry he was nevertheless " the great teacher who was imitated, and rarely surpassed, by the writers of the classical school ⁴". Saint Ephraem's *discourses*, written for the most part in verses of seven syllables—there are a few in prose—"have never been surpassed for their suave, sublime and persuasive eloquence... No other writer has ever possessed his power of bringing words to the eyes, while the reader is so profoundly stirred that he does not perceive that the discourse is often extremely wordy⁵". And as for his innumerable *hymns* "they belong to that class of noble, elevated, harmonious poetry⁶

R. Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 16-17.

* A certain resemblance between Syriac and Byzantine hymnology has led eriveli to suppose that the latter derived from the first. This hypothesis, first elevated in 1805, had little success, probably, as R. Duval says, because Syriac poetry was too little known. Nevertheless it remains feasible. C. Emereau, in the *II.* is mentioned in the bibliography, states that it was the Greek translations of Saint Ephraem, made after the end of the fourth century, that gave rise to Byzantine hymnology which reached such a degree of perfection in the East.

† K. Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 20-22. — 4 *Ibid.*, p. 19. — 5 J. Lamy, *op. cit.*, iv, p. 165.

According to Sozomen, he wrote three million verses (εἰσὼν) *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 16.

which teaches and charms at the same time; that doctimti poetry which has its admirable counterpart in the writing!» «4 his imitator, although perhaps not his equal, Saint Gregoflj Nazianzen. Such hymns are a sound and delightful aid, iu M only to piety but also to faith ! ”,

Despite the difference of style, both the sermons and the hymns h.ivi often the same subject. If the theme and not the style is considered Ephraem's poetical work may be classed as follows :

a) *Exegetical* works, chiefly sermons, about 45 ' ;

b) *Controversial** and *dogmatic*† writings (150 hymns and discourses)

c) Discourses on the *mysteries* (about 180)s;

‡) *Panegyrics* on the saints of the Old and the New Testament4.

e) A great number of *moral* discourses on the virtues, among which should be mentioned 76 exhortations to penance', and the discourses ofl the Rogations .

f) *Funeral elegies*".

The Carmina nisibena 10 belie their name, for they are moral rather than historical. Among the 77 songs contained in this collection may be found a fine dialogue in 17 hymns between the devil and Death, wherein each endeavours to show that he is the more powerful “.

The writing entitled the Testament of Saint Ephraem comes from the School of Edessa, and perhaps from Ephraem himself

C) The doctrine of Saint Ephraem.

Saint Ephraem's teaching had a considerable *moral anti ascetical* influence in the Eastern Church and especially in the monasteries. It should be regarded from this standpoint if it is to be well understood.

* J. La my, *ibid.*, 183.

“ On various passages of the Old Testament (*Op. omn.*, syr., It, 316-395), on Paradise (*ibid.*, nt, 562-598), on the selling of Joseph by his brothers (La my, h i, 249-260).

3 Against the heretics who denied the Trinity (*Op. omn.*, syr., IH, 1-150), against the Jews (*ibid.*, 209-224), against Julian and the Jews (*Overbeck* I sq).

4 On the Pearl, or on the faith (*Op. omn.*, syr., HI, 150-164; 164-208); On the Incarnation (La my, I, 145-274).

s Twenty-two on the Birth of Jesus Christ (*Op. omn.*, syr., II, 396-436; ill, 599); (La my, II 427-516); fifteen on the Epiphany (La my, i, i-i44); and other on various mysteries (La my, passim).

6 Twenty discourses on the Blessed Virgin should be noted (La my, ii, 517-642). Others extol the Patriarchs, Elias, Daniel, the Apostles, the confessors and the martyrs. — “ In *Op. omn.*, syr., III, 367-561.

8 La my, in, 1-126. — ‘ *Op. omn.*, syr., in, 225-359.

10 Edit. Bickeli., Leipzig, 1886. Short synopsis in Fessier Jungmann.

" For all the matters treated by Saint Ephraem, see Fessier-Jungmann, *op. cit.*, η, p. 18-41.

“ *Op. omn.*, yr., n, 395-410. R. Du vai. suspects the authenticity of this work in its present condition, but admits the substance of it. See *fournal Asiatique*, xviii (1901), p. 234-319.

At the basis of this teaching is found an unreserved admission of man's free-will. Man has been made in the *image* of God, a) by his free-will and his domination over all creation; b) by his aptness to receive the gifts of God; c) by the facility with which his mind can conceive and apply itself to all things.

To this natural image of God were added in our first parents precious supernatural gifts, consisting especially of immortality, wisdom and knowledge, and even a certain external grace which concealed from them their nudity, and which was really a reflection of the spiritual gifts of the soul. All that was lost by sin, yet free-will, although weakened, still remains: Saint Ephraem is very affirmative on this point²; fallen man has need of grace, which does not coerce and destroy, but rather aids his liberty³.

Saint Ephraem likes to look on Christian life as a spiritual combat⁴. He provides arms against all the vices, especially the eight *capital vices*, and recommends temperance, prayer and the study of the Scriptures. Among his favourite *virtues* may be mentioned charity, virginity, patience, humility, and lastly penance, of which he often speaks. He strenuously teaches the vanity of the things of this world, and exhorts fervent souls to retire from the world. He addressed innumerable instructions to *monks*; among these a little treatise "On the spiritual life"⁶, another on the education of monks⁷, and two little works "On virtue, to a novice". Lastly, there is still extant a little writing on the dignity of the *priesthood* and the great holiness it requires.

Saint Ephraem loves to show his devotion to Our Lady by dwelling on her great privileges¹⁰, and especially two of these: a) her *virginity*, left untouched by her divine Motherhood: Mary was a virgin *ante partum, in partu, post partum*; b) her *holiness*, which Ephraem even compares with that of Our Lord: "Thou alone and Thy Mother are in all ways

¹ *Op. omn., gr.*, I, 128.

³ See the four sermons on free-will: *Op. omn., syr.*, in, 359 sq.

⁴ J. Lamy, *Hymni et serin.*, I, 101. — * *Op. omn., gr.*, in, 461; I, 66; etc.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 321-322; (428-432?). See below p. 510.

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 258-282. — ⁷ *Ibid.*, in, 337-356.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 201-216, 216-229. See also *ibid.*, p. 1-18.

⁹ *Ibid.*, in, 1-6. This sermon is sometimes edited immediately following Saint John Chrysostom's *On Priesthood*.

¹⁰ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 214.

wholly pure; for in Thee is no spot, and in Thy Mother no stain 1."

Mary is the mother of Christ, and the Church is His mystical spouse who distributes grace and truth to her children, Ephraem exalts the *priesthood*, and in particular *Peter*, who is the principle of the priesthood, from whom all priests receive their power of sanctifying;² Peter is the foundation of the Church and has the right of watching³ over all the Apostles and bishops who build up the Church by their teaching; In is the source of truth and the head of the disciples. Such is the teaching which the Syrian Doctor, although far away from Rome, found in the Scriptures and in the tradition of his Church.

Saint Ephraem deals, although not very precisely, with most of the Sacraments. There is nothing ambiguous, however, in his affirmation of the Real Presence in the *Blessed Sacrament* 1,

Lastly, his Eschatological teaching is. «) The *judgment* is one of the truths from which Saint Ephraem draws the most powerful effects. He divides men into three classes: those who are *suprajudicium* (the saints), *subjudicio* (imperfect Christians), and *extrajudicium* (the wicked and the damned). b) All are destined to pass through the flames of Hell, the first will not suffer, the last will remain there, and the second will be purified therein. Moreover, like Heaven, Hell is *eternal*; the contrary teaching has been wrongly attributed to Ephraem. c) To his mind Heaven consists of three parts, the summit, the sides and the bounds or door. Before the resurrection of the body, it would seem that the souls of the just are admitted into this third dwelling, which is, as it were, a foretaste of beatitude; nothing more than this can be read into Saint Ephraem's texts, if they are properly understood.

The Syrians' admiration for Saint Ephraem's teaching and eloquence, is testified by the titles with which they have honoured him: *Doctor of the Universe*, *column of the Church*, the *eloquent mouth*, the *prophet of the Syrians*, the *harp of the Holy Ghost*.

1 *Carmina nisibena*, x.xvn, 8.

² J. Lamy, *Hymni*, I, 73, 267-411-533.

• The Syriac word *Bahama*, inspector, indicates, says Lamy, a *superior* who inspects and examines, chooses and rejects those he examines. *Univ. cath.*, tv, 171.

³ See T. Lamy, *ibid.*, 171-180. More important texts in *Hymni et sermones*, i, 413 sq., 603, 623. — 5 See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, 219-221.

III. SYRIAC CATHOLIC LITERATURE AFTER SAINT EPHRAEM.

The following are the most outstanding of the writers who followed in the footsteps of Saint Ephraem until the middle of the fifth century, at which period the Church of Syria lapsed into Nestorianism and Monophysitism.

In the fourth century, Mar Aba, Zenobius (deacon of Edessa), I'aulonas, Cyrillona (to be identified perhaps with Absamya, saint Ephraem's nephew) and Gregory, a monk. Nothing or almost nothing remains of their writings¹.

In the fifth century we find the name of Marouta, 3 Bishop of Maiphertat, author of a history of the Council of Nicaea and a collection of Acts of the Persian Martyrs who died under Sapor II (310-380). This period, however, is illustrated chiefly by the names of *Rabulas* and *Isaac of Antioch*.

Rabulas³, Bishop of Edessa from 412 to 435, is noted for his resistance to Nestorianism which marked the last years of his life, while his successor, Ibas, was a protagonist of the opposite camp. He was a zealous reformer of the clergy and the monks, and "applied himself energetically to the task of uprooting the old heresies, already combated by Ephraem, and which still numbered their followers at Edessa". He wrote prose and verse in Greek and Syriac; only fragments of his work are extant.

Isaac of Antioch, called *the Great* (365 to about 460), a native of Amid, was a monk living in the neighbourhood of Antioch. He was a writer almost as fertile as Ephraem. His works for the most part have not yet been edited; 37 out of a total of 200 known writings were published by Bickell in two volumes (1873-1877). A modern reader would regard some of these as wordy in the extreme (one of Isaac's liturgical sermons on a parrot which sang the hymn of the *trisagion* at Antioch has no less than 2133 lines). Since Bickell's edition a number of his sermons have again been edited⁴.

The following are also worthy of mention :

a) Baiai', a country-bishop (*chorepiscopus*) from the district of Aleppo, was the author of very many doctrinal poetical writings; some of these are attributed to Saint Ephraem⁵.

Dadjesu, Patriarch of Seleucia (421-456). A number of this author's Works, as yet unedited, and canons of a Council held in 426, are extant, he was a witness of the first controversies which preluded Nestorianism.

¹ R. Duval, *op. cit.*, p. 337-338. — * *Ibid.*, p. 132-133.

² *Had.*, 341-343. Texts in OVERBECK, *op. cit.* See also M. J. LAGRANGE, *Lecrivain syrien du Ve siècle*, Rabulas, *Œuvres d'Edesse*, in *Mélanges d'hisl. lité.*, Paris, 1915.

³ F. Bedjan, *Homilia S. Isaacs syri Antiocheni*, I, Paris, 1903. This author holds the opinion that several sermons attributed to Isaac of Antioch should be attributed to a certain Isaac of Amid who never fell away from Catholicism; The Church of Antioch lapsed into Monophysitism towards the end of his life. Dada, another monk of Amid, also wrote a great deal, but both his hymns and his Hymns are now lost.

⁴ *See* Overbeck. Studies by G. Bickell and V. Zetterstéen, 1902.

⁵ ASSBMANI, *Bibl. orient.*, VII.

SECOND PART

THE CLIMAX

OF THE GREAT PATRISTIC CENTURY

(From 361 to 430)

CHAPTER I.

Preliminary Outline. The Heresies.

I. PRELIMINARY OUTLINE.

A) Main characters of this period.

Although, as has been said, the whole of the fourth century is particularly outstanding in the history of early patristic writings, it was more especially during the second part of this period that the Church was graced, both in the East and in the West, by the most powerful mind-Christendom has ever known. It must not be thought, however, that they occupied an isolated position, a high-spot in the literary history of the Church, for, at the same time a considerable number of other really talented authors were also writing, and in many cases strengthening the influence of the great Fathers. It is not surprising therefore that at this time the works which were produced were as numerous and as varied as they were profound and powerful^{*}.

The Fathers of this period were men of great culture. All the arts of Greece and Rome were drawn into the service of Christ. With very few exceptions all these men were great scholars: they were always simple of heart, but their minds had been whetted by long acquaintance with the great works of antiquity; armed with the intellectual integrity and the suppleness and love of the beautiful they had found therein, they threw themselves wholeheartedly into the defence and explanation of the faith. Meanwhile Paganism did not allow itself to be robbed of what it thought to be its own without putting forth a last effort]

^{*} See the Introduction to Bk. II, p. 291-202.

The final spasmodic eruption of the old beliefs under Julian (361-363) was more of an artistic and literary nature than political. Pagan society made a dying attempt at recovery, but was beaten down for ever, and its irrevocable fall was marked by Julian's end. Greek civilisation had been powerless in providing that moral energy to the Old World which would have ensured its continued vitality. Even the Fathers who appeared at this time could not arrest the process of disruption. They were able, however, to retain all that was good in the letters of a dying world; they salvaged the glorious remains of all that was humane and great in the work of the two peoples who had governed the world, or at least in the work of their greatest and noblest men.

Although the Fathers never saw their Christian social Ideal fully carried into practice, it was not because they failed to preach it. Saint Ambrose, for example, was able to bear immediately on the political actions of the rulers, and never hesitated to remind them of the conditions which guarantee the independence and consequently the strength of the Church. Most of them, however, had a narrower sphere of influence, but not less important, whether they were called, like Saint John Chrysostom, to preach Christian morality to a people too easily inclined to looseness, or to defend the cause of the poor against the rich, or like Saint Basil, to organise great works of charity, so that all might see the power of the Church in succouring misery.

Here, however, we are concerned above all with the teaching of these men. They were pre-eminently doctors, the *great Doctors of the Church*. They were pre-occupied far more with theology than sociology². The pressing need of resisting heresy, of showing to all that there was in contradiction between faith and reason, led them all, by various roads and according to their particular gifts,

¹ The famous claim of Symmachus (383), opposed by Saint Ambrose (see below), did no more than turn on the question of re-establishing the altar of Victory in the Roman Senate, while the attempt at a Pagan restoration led by Aetius in 392 is scarce worth mentioning.

² This remark may also be applied to the Church, in the sense that many of the Fathers were more taken up with following her teaching than in studying her in herself; we cannot expect therefore to find a complete *Ecclesiology* in the Writings of each one of the Fathers. The essential elements, however, may be furnished in the doctrinal works of this time, taken as a whole.

to an ever deeper study of revealed truth. This it is time gives such interest to their work, and which provides the principle on which it is proposed to divide this study.

B) Division of the Second Part.

The Fathers of the East and the Fathers of the West will be dealt with successively. In the East, after Saint *Epiphanius*, who can be attached neither to the School of Antioch nor to that of Alexandria, but who is representative of a strict traditionalism, come *Didymus* and especially the *Cappadocians*, founders of the new School of Alexandria, Apollinaris may be placed between these latter and those who combated, Diodorus of Tarsis and Theodore of Mopsuestia the masters of the *School of Antioch*. The greatest glory of this school is *Saint John Chrysostom*. Among the lesser writers will be mentioned the ascetics, who at that time formed an extremely interesting group.

In the West the *Popes*, who provided the official link between all the Churches of the world, composed during this period in question the first extant decretals. On the other hand, the most talented doctors maintained an intellectual contact with the East: *Saint Ambrose*, an assiduous reader of Origen and Saint Basil, yet original in his own moral teaching; *Saint Jerome*, though his life was spent in the East had his spiritual home in Rome and composed works which were Latin to the core. And then, passing over a number of less talented writers, on the eve of the disappearance of the Latin world, about to be submerged in the vast overflowing of the barbarian hordes, comes *Saint Augustine's* enormous work, which summed up and gathered together in one vast stream all that was best in the Church from its very beginnings.

A distinction has been made here between the *East* and the *West*. As has already been said, even from the fourth century there was a growing tendency to division within the empire, and the causes which threatened its unity had the effect not only in the political but also in the religious sphere. This dualism, however, must not be exaggerated—as yet it was no more than a tendency. Despite differences of character, purpose and tongue, the sense of Christian unity still predominated, especially in those eminent men who are now

¹ See above, the Introduction to Book II, p. 294.

to be studied. A striking proof of this is the united front they presented to schism of all kinds.

The classification that has been set out above corresponds, as far as it is possible for it to do so, to the growth of doctrine, especially on those points on which it was chiefly attacked, i. The *Trinitarian question* was the first to attract attention in the fourth century : after 360 came the triumph of the Nicene faith. This was achieved in a large measure by the Cappadocians, since the controversy was waged particularly in the East. Saint Augustine's splendid work on the Trinity summed up and codified the results of these controversies and revealed new and profound aspects of the doctrine. 2. The *Christological problem* had already arisen at Antioch in the group formed by Apollinaris, Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. It did not reach its height, however, until the beginning of the following period, when Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, sometime of Antioch, dared to raise his voice against the Divine Motherhood of Mary. 3. The Latin world in particular was troubled by two serious controversies which came from Africa, and which are especially famous for the part Saint Augustine took therein : *Donatism* and *Pelagianism*. These will be discussed immediately. Other less important errors, such as that of Priscillianus and Helvidius, will be dealt with later, as the occasion arises.

II. DONATISM AND PELAGIANISM.

A). *Donatism*. Donatism derives its name from two men who were concerned with its beginnings. In 312, immediately following the persecution of Galerius, the authority of the recently elected Archbishop of Carthage, *Cæcilianus*, «as called in question, on the pretext that Felix of Aptunga, the bishop who had consecrated him, was a *traditor* (i. e., guilty of having delivered the Scriptures up to the Pagans, in accordance with the prescriptions of the edicts of Diocletian, etc. : A Council of 70 Numidian bishops assembled at Carthage set up a rival in the person of Marjorinus, who was con-

■ ' See the chapter dealing with these authors.

At the bottom of all this was Lucilla, a great lady, rich and pious, whom Priscillianus, while yet an archdeacon, had offended by forbidding her to continue the extraordinary practice of kissing, before communion, the relic of a pseudo-martyr not recognised by the Church. She placed all her resources at the service of the rebels.

separated by *Donatus of Casae Nigrae*, one of Caecilianus' enemies and real leader of the dissident party. The real organiser, who gave it its name, was *Donatus the Great, of Carthage*, who succeeded Marjorinus in 315. He himself was succeeded by *Panninianus* (355-391), who carried on his work with no less skill and ability; his treatises were refuted by Saint Optatus of Milevis (about 366) and Saint Augustine (about 400).

The success of Donatism must be put down to the powerful organisation which it received right from its inception. 1. It was based on a *teaching* containing very few complications, very precise and trenchant, and well calculated to attract simple minds. It may be reduced to two points : (1) *The Church* is a society of saints from which sinners are excluded; the *Sacraments* are worthless unless they are administered by the priests of this holy Church. 2. Donatus the Great set up throughout Latin Africa a Donatist *hierarchy* in opposition to the Catholic hierarchy; this episcopate numbered more than 300 members. 3. Lastly, bands of zealous propagandists, vowed, it was said, to continence, but in reality ferocious righters of wrongs, always on the look-out for a fight, placed themselves, together with their cudgels and their fanaticism, at the service of the Donatist cause. They put their hands to all manner of violent deeds, shouting their war-cry of *Deo laudes*. They were given the name of *Circumcellions* because they were always seen prowling "around the homesteads" (*circum cellas*).

The Donatists, although condemned by ecclesiastical authority at Rome (313) and then at Arles (314), and even by the civil authority (Constantine made a pronouncement against them in 316 at Milan), refused to submit and took the line of open resistance. *Constantine* made a mistake in meting out too lenient treatment to them, of which they took advantage by abusing the Catholics, and even the public authorities, by word and deed. *Constantine* (337-350) contained himself in patience for ten years, and then took forceful measures in 347, when he banished their bishops and rendered peace to Africa. Julian (361-363) recalled the exiles and allowed Donatism again to raise its head. Then began a new period of schism, marked by the doctrinal intervention of Optatus of Milevis (against Parmenianus) and Saint Augustine in particular. This doctrinal action would have been in many ways abortive had not the Empire, after 400,

again given its support to restore order in a region where even the public peace was threatened by unruly factions in the name of religion.

Among the Donatisti writers, besides *Pannonianus* who has already been mentioned, are *Tychonius* and *Petilianus*.

Tychonius was a lay theologian, who, although attached to the Donatisti party, retained a number of personal and independent opinions. In two works written against the Catholics, he made two important concessions, recognising that the Church contains both the good and the wicked, who will not be separated until the end of the world. *Pammenianus* called him to order in an official letter (about 378), but he refused to submit and was excommunicated by his Church in 380. He never, however, became a Catholic, but continued to write, and composed in particular about 282 a *Liber regularum*, containing the general principles of Hermeneutics in the form of seven rules, which were utilised by Saint Augustine in his treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*. Augustine remarked that *Tychonius* was gifted *acri ingenio* and *uberi eloquio*.

Petilianus, Bishop of Cirta, was the most impetuous of all the Donatists in the time of Augustine. He never received nor deserved such flattering comments as *Tychonius*. He had practised as a lawyer, was an apostate from Catholicism, and his argumentation consisted chiefly of invective¹.

B). Pelagianism. It was in Africa also that the struggle against Pelagianism was the most intense, although this heresy had originated elsewhere. Here it will suffice to recall the principal points of this doctrine and the chief dates in its history.

I. Pelagianism was a heresy having a naturalist tendency and based on Stoicism. At the beginning of the fourth century it was *vulgarised* by a Breton monk, Pelagius, and his disciple, Caelestius. A few years later, about 420, it was logically set out and built up into an imposing body of doctrine by Julian, Bishop of Eclanum. The system developed by these three men, taken as a whole, hangs fairly well together.

d) The basic principle consists in the affirmation of the moral strength and self-sufficiency of man's free-will. Man, relying entirely *on his own power*, can *always* will and do the good, even when, in act, he neither wills nor does it;

¹ For the history of Donatism, see, besides the various *Histories of the Church*, J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* n, p. 222-231. P. Batiffol, *La paix Constantinienne et le catholicisme*, p. 269-306, and *Le catholicisme de Saint Augustin*, ch. h. p. 77-117 (before Saint Augustine). L. Saltet, *Les riordinations*, Paris, 1007, p. 59-64. P. Monceaux, *Histoire liti, de l'Afrique chrétienne*, t. iv, *Le Onatisme* (1912); t. v, *Saint Optât et les premiers écrivains donatistes* (1920); ¹ vi, *Littérature donatiste au temps de saint Augustin* {1922}; t. vu. *Saint Augustin et le Donatisme* (1923).

willing and doing are acts depending only on man himself. In reality there have always been men who have never sinned.

ι) There is no such thing as *original sin*. Before he sinned Adam was created mortal and subject to the passions; we are harmed only by the wicked example he has set us. Man's proneness to sin is due to deeply rooted habit.

ϰ) It follows from this that *baptism* is not absolutely necessary for salvation. It is required nevertheless for those who would be members of the kingdom of Heaven, which is the Church, and who desire to be in communion with Christ. It is also efficacious in effacing actual sin.

ιϰ) *Sanctifying grace*, which is given in baptism, is not the necessary foundation of supernatural activity, but only a remedy for actual sins, or a spiritual ornament of the Christian and a sign of his divine adoption.

ϰι) *Actual graces* can be no more than *exterior graces* for the purpose of instruction and example, or, at the most, interior graces of *illumination*. Interior grace acting immediately *on the will* is not admitted. For the Pelagians then, "Divine activity does not penetrate to the very heart of human activity to widen and transform it! Hence there is no such thing as predestination in the proper sense of the word, but merely foreknowledge.

ϰι) *The Redemption* is not a rebirth, a change from death to life, but only an uplifting to a higher life (divine adoption); the influence of Christ is purely external. Such a teaching dries up the very fountains of *religion* by suppressing the mercy of God and the trustful prayers of mankind; it is rendered no more than a cold contract between debtor and creditor.

2. Pelagius 2 acquired these ideas, or at least the principle of them at the beginning of the fifth century at Rome, where he won over Caelestius to the same opinions. Together they propagated them in Sicily (409) and then in Africa (410). Pelagius went from there to Palestine, while Caelestius, having remained in Africa, carried on with his proselytizing.

¹ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, p. 445.

² According to Mercator, Pelagius borrowed his doctrine from a Syrian priest named Rufinus, who was known to Saint Jerome who had befriended him at Bethlehem and later sent him to Rome to keep a watch on the activities of Rufinus of Aquileia. See F. Cavallera, S', *Jérôme* π, p. 96-97.

ing; soon, however, he was excommunicated by a Council at Carthage (411) and was forced to take refuge in the East, he was ordained priest at Ephesus. Pelagius was denounced in 415 to John, Bishop of Jerusalem, by Paulus Orosius, a friend and emissary of Saint Augustine, but was not condemned. At the end of 415 he was even declared innocent by the Council of Diospolis (Lydda) in spite of his accusation by two Gallic bishops then passing through Palestine. Whatever may have been the motives of the Eastern bishops, whether they were tricked by Pelagius or hand in glove with him, the fact remains that this decision was a triumph for Pelagius. The Church of Africa, however, was not deceived. Two Councils were held in 416, one at Carthage and the other at Milevis, which denounced the reformers to the Pope.

Innocent / condemned Pelagius 1 on the 27th January 417, a few days before he died. His successor, Zozimus (417-418), however, prejudiced in favour of Pelagius by a *libellus fidei*2 which the latter had sent to him with the approval of the Bishop of Jerusalem, and deceived by the ambiguous declarations of Caelestius, who had come in person to Rome, accused the African bishops of undue haste, and charged them to justify their accusations in Rome within two months. A council was hastily called at Carthage (417) and succeeded in obtaining an extension of time from the Pope, and in 418 another general Council (attended by more than 200 bishops) fulminated 9 canons against the heresy 3. Finally, the Pope, better advised, condemned the two heretics and sent to the whole Church an *Epistola tractoria* which was to be subscribed by all bishops. Eighteen Italian bishops refused and were in consequence deposed and banished.

1 *Epist.*, 29, 30, 31 (or in *Aug. letters*, *Epist.*, 181, 182, 183).

2 *T. L.*, 45, 1716-1718 (or 48, 488-491). The other extant works of Pelagius are : a) a letter to Demetriades, *P. L.*, 33, 1099-1120 (or 30, 15-45) : b) a commentary on the 13 Epistles of Saint Paul, a work which has been revised by a Catholic hand, *P. L.*, 30, 645-902; re-edited by Souter, in *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1922. (See also Dom Chapman, in *Dev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1922 and 1923). Only fragments remain of the *De natura* (*P. L.*, 48, 596-606) and the *De libero arbitrio* (*P. L.*, 48, 611-615). A number of Pelagius' orthodox writings are also known : a *Defide trinitatis* now entirely lost, and an *Eclogarum liber*, of which it is thought that fragments are still extant, *P. L.*, 48, 593-596.

* *T. L.*, 45, 1728-1730. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, n. toi-108 (canon 8 is omitted). It is probable that all these canons were approved by Zozimus, while it is certain for canons 4, 5, 6, which cite the Pope's *Epistola tractoria*, *P. L.*, 20, 603 sq.

One of these bishops, Julian of Eclanum ¹, who had recently been won over to Pelagianism, henceforward became the chief defender of the sect, while the two founders began to take a back place. It was he whom Saint Augustine harried the most vigorously. He died destitute in 454 a.

¹ Julian's writings, refuted by Saint Augustine, are : a) four books *Ad Tuñ bantiim* (419) against Augustine's "*De nuptiis et concupiscentia*"; 6) eight book, *Ad Riorum* (421-422) against Augustine's refutation of the four preceding book».! The extant portions of these writings are in the form of quotations contained ill; Saint Augustine's work. Diverse exegetical writings have also been attributed to Julian : commentaries on the minor prophets (of the pseudo-Rutinus), on 131 (codex casinensis, 871), on the Psalms (attributed to Theodore of Mopsuestia).] See Dom Morin, *Dev. JHnid.*, 1913; Vaccari, diverse studies, 1915-192.18 A. d'Aies, *Julien d'Eclane exigit*, in *Rech. Sc. Rei.*, 1916, p. 311-324. Sai also A. Bruckner. *Julian von Eclanum*, in *Texte u. Unters.*, 1897.

* On Pelagianism, apart from the *Histories of the Church*, see J. TIVERONI-*Hist. Dogm.*, It, p. 436-459, and P. BATIFFOL, *Le catholicisme de «ii Augustin*, ch. vi, vu, vin, p. 349 508.

FIRST SECTION

CHAPTER II.

Saint Epiphanius.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions : P. G., 41-43. Greek edition, Dindorf, 5 vol., Leipzig, 1859-1862

2. Studies: J. Martin, *Saint Epiphane*, in *Annales de philosophie chrétienne*, 1907-1908. Fessler-Jungmann, *Institutiones patr.*, I, 605-623. C. Verschaffel, *Epiphane (saint)*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 363-365. See also F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, Louvain-Paris, 1922.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER OF SAINT EPIPHANIUS.

A) His Life.

Saint Epiphanius was born in Palestine, not far from Eleutheropolis near Gaza, about 315. He was given a good Christian and literary education by his parents. His chief interest was languages, of which he knew five : Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, and Latin. He was drawn to the monastic life by the advice and example of Saint Hilarión, the great hermit of Gaza, and by the impression he received from a visit to the Egyptian monks made at the age of twenty. On his return he founded a monastery at Besanduk, not far from Eleutheropolis, where he lived for thirty years, immersed in the direction of his disciples, prayer and study.² Here he acquired a great reputation for holiness and learning, to which was due his election in 367 to the metropolitan See of Cyprus, Constantia (Salamis).

¹ Saint Jerome admiringly calls him " the Pentaglot ". *Adv. RuJ.*, II, 22.

² Saint Epiphanius was a friend of his fellow countryman, Saint Hilarión, whose life he wrote; this was used later by Saint Jerome (F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 132). Like Hilarión he was a great ascetic, as may be seen in ch. 21 of his *Expositio Jidei*, in which he supposes the existence of a mystical hierarchy of

■ids, distinct from the official hierarchy. The degrees of this hierarchy, in order of dignity are : 1. Virginity; 2. the solitary or eremitic life; 3. continence; 4. widowhood; 5. the marriage state.

Although little is known of his life at this time, Saint Epiphanius must have been a model bishop, jealous of the spiritual wellbeing of his diocese, if we can judge by his reputation as a "saint of miracles". He was particularly vigilant as regards the *orthodoxy* of his flock. His two chief works, which were composed during the first years of his episcopate, the *Ancoratus* (374) and the *Panarion* (377), reveal him busy with his fight against heresy, bringing to light every least sign of error. At the same period (376-377) he entered into controversy with his erstwhile friend, Apollinaris. It was Origenism, however, that he attacked most vehemently. He considered Origen the father of all heresy; bethought he perceived his influence everywhere and harried it relentlessly. His zeal for the overthrow of Origenism led him to quarrel first with *John of Jerusalem* and later with the Bishop of Constantinople, Saint John Chrysostom himself.

The Origenist quarrel had its beginnings at Jerusalem in 393, with the arrival of the monk Aterbius who accused the Bishop John, Rufinus and Saint Jerome of favouring Origenism. Epiphanius, who may have been the instigator of this accusation, came himself in the following year about Easter time, and in a public speech in the presence of the Bishop condemned the teaching of Origen. The Bishop retorted in the evening of the same day by preaching against the Anthropomorphites. Epiphanius withdrew from communion with John and retired to Eleutheropolis. Shortly afterwards he ordained Paulinianus, a monk of Bethlehem and younger brother of Jerome, against his will and against the will of the Bishop of Jerusalem from whom he depended. Epiphanius returned to his island; the bishop protested,* and Epiphanius wrote him a letter which only aggravated the affair.² A few years later, Theophilus, the wily Patriarch of Alexandria, who had for a long time been an Origenist, suddenly turned

* Paulinianus, on his return to Bethlehem, was interdicted by his bishop and Jerome sent him oil to Cyprus. He returned to his brother much later when the quarrel had been settled.

³ Saint Epiphanius makes no excuse for infringing the prerogatives of the Bishop of Jerusalem. He seemed to think that, on the contrary, he had done him a service. If the letter which narrates the following episode is authentic (n, I) he had so little regard for his rights that he had torn up, in the bishop's presence, in the parish church of Anablatha, a veil bearing an image of Christ; as compensation he sent a new veil to the church, but far from apologising to John he left him to task with almost fanatical zeal.

his coat and began a campaign against Origen's followers, the monks of Nitria, and later against Saint John Chrysostom who, it was said, had been guilty of sheltering some of these men out of sympathy for Origen. Epiphanius was overjoyed at this move of Theophilus and threw in his lot with him without stopping to consider that all the accusations brought against Saint John Chrysostom were false. Having again thundered against Origenism in a Council held in Cyprus in 402, he went to Constantinople where he entered into communication with the bishop's enemies and made ready to oppose him publicly; fortunately for him he was enlightened in time as to the true facts of the case. He avowed his mistake, and set off immediately for Cyprus; he died on the way (403) at the age of 88.

B) His character.

The above details are a fair indication of Epiphanius' character. He was extremely impetuous in his actions, always taking the shortest and most obvious path, paying little heed to that worldly prudence, with all its subtilty and tact, which was so greatly esteemed even by churchmen in the East at that time. Such a character evidently left him open to deception by men less scrupulous than he. That he was really *zealous* has never been gainsaid. Too aggressive he may have been at times, but his sincerity was obvious, and his great *firmness* was not only meritorious but useful and necessary in the face of the widespread compromises of the period. He carried his virtues to excess perhaps, but this excess was much less perilous than a lack of virtue would have been in an atmosphere teeming with factions and differences of doctrine. Looked at from this standpoint his altitude is not to be despised. In many cases he has been too little understood.

Epiphanius was not a very original thinker; he was neither a theologian, nor a philosopher, but a *scholar*, a great reader of books, who inserted in his works many documents of great worth for the history of Christian thought. His criticism unfortunately is not very sound, while his accounts of historical facts, which are not of his own period, need correction. Moreover neither his style nor his composition are those of a true writer: he is too verbose. Nevertheless his works are not wholly lacking in interest, as has sometimes been averred, and many details are worthy of note.

II. WORKS AND DOCTRINE OF SAINT EPIPHANIUS.

A) Works.

Saint Epiphanius' works consist of two *controversial works* (*Ankotulus* and *Panarion*) and two treatises on *Biblical Archaeology*.

1. The *Ancoratus* (Ἀγκυρωτόν, the Well-anchored) was composed in 374 at the request of the Christians of Pamphilia, who desired to have a synopsis of Christian teaching on the Trinity and especially on the Holy Ghost. The saint wrote this work for them as a sure *anchor* amidst the constant tossing of the Arian or Semi-Arian controversies. The doctrinal explanation is augmented by the addition of *two creeds*, recommended by the bishop for the administration of baptism: the first and shorter (in ch. 119) seems to be the baptismal symbol adopted by Constantia shortly before the coming of Epiphanius; the second (in ch. 120) is perhaps Saint Epiphanius' own work (who either composed it entirely or revised that of Jerusalem). It is possible that the former was used as a basis for the Constantinopolitan creed (381).

2. The *Panarion* (*Moderine Chest* against 80 heresies), usually cited under the title *Haereses*, was composed about 374-377 and is Epiphanius' chief work. It was written for the purpose of curing those who had been bitten by the serpents of heresy and to preserve the healthy. Epiphanius regarded the number 80 as symbolical, and in order to reach it, was obliged to classify among the heresies even philosophical errors, some of which dated from before the advent of the Christian era: Hellenism, Epicurianism, Stoicism are called heresies, and all Pharisees, Scythians and Barbarians, etc., are heretics. The value of the work is not constant. The first books have but little authority, since Epiphanius does no more than reproduce the work of his forerunners, Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus; the part which treats of the middle and end of the fourth century is much superior, since he was in many cases an immediate witness of contemporary events. The volume comes to an end with a lengthy *conclusion* of a moral and disciplinary nature, often cited under the name of *Expositio fidei* (The Summary Ἀνακεφαλαιῶσι, (passages from the *Panarion*), which is often edited together with the latter work, would appear to be due to another writer.

3. On *Biblical Archaeology* Epiphanius has left an important writing entitled *Of Measures and Weights*, and which treats, in addition to that, in the first Part, of the canon and the versions of the Old Testament, and deals with Palestinian Geography in the third Part. A Latin work of Epiphanius *On the Twelve Precious Stones* which adorned the high-priest's breastplate is also extant. His other exegetical works are lost.

¹ P. G., 43, 11-236. *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, I, 1915.

² P. G., 41, 155-1200 and 42, 9-832. *Corpus* of Berlin, Leipzig, I, 1915; II, 1922.

³ P. G., 42, 773-832. The complete title is *A True and Abridged Discourse on the Faith of the Catholic and Apostolic Church*.

⁴ P. G., 42, 833-888. — s P. G., 43, 237-294.

⁵ P. G., 43, 293-304.

4. Of his Letters only two remain ; one to *John of Jerusalem* ¹, the other to Saint Jerome dealing with Origenism². All other works attributed to him are apocryphal³*

B) His Doctrine.

Saint Epiphanius' teaching contains very little that is remarkable from a speculative point of view. His witness, however, is important since he was always a firm upholder of tradition. He tended to identify the latter with the *ordinary magisterium* of the Church more clearly than anyone else in the fourth century. The Church alone, he says, has received the content of tradition, and it is in her teaching and her decisions that the faithful find the truth⁴. The Church moreover is built upon *Peter*, the immovable foundation of the faith⁵; and in the fourth century it is the Bishop of Rome who holds the privileges of Peter. Epiphanius realised this to the full, and far from contradicting it, he upheld it in the way indicated by Saint Damasus in 377. It was during this same year that he worked in collaboration, at Antioch, with Paulinus, the bishop who had been recognised by Rome, against the Apollinarist Vitalis⁶. Some time after, he went to Rome, together with Paulinus and Saint Jerome, on ecclesiastical business (381).

Other more outstanding points of Saint Epiphanius' teaching were :

1. As regards Trinitarian theology, he is very clear on the procession of the Holy Ghost, Who, he says, has His being from the Father *and the Son* (Α Πατρί *Filioque* ἔκ Πατρὸς καὶ Που⁷). He does not render the idea of the word *being, proceeding*, by the verb ἐκπορεύεσθαι, since this word was still usually taken as meaning a derivation from a principle which itself has no principle, such as the Father.

2. In his Christology he vigorously maintained the integrity of Christ's human nature against Apollinaris, but on the other hand, unlike certain Antiochians, he maintained

¹ P. G., 43, 379-392. This letter is taken from among the letters of Saint Jerome (*Ep. y/*) who translated it. It is mentioned above in the Life of Epiphanius. — ² P. G., 43, 391-392. Hieron., *Epist.* 91.

³ See below, *Doctrine*, 4.

⁴ *Haer.*, LXI, 6; *dncor.*, 63. — ⁵ *Haer.*, LIX, 7, 8; *elnear.*, 9.

⁶ *Haer.*, LXXVII.

⁷ *Aneor.*, 9. Ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς οὐσίας Πατρός καὶ Γίου, */bib.*, 7. See also *ibid.*, 71-75. He also says : Παρὰ Πατρός εκπορευόμενου καὶ εκ του Που λαμβάνον. *Ibid.*, 7.

the communication of idioms and especially the title of Θεοτόκο applied to Our Lady ». / j

3. With regard to the Blessed Virgin, as has already been remarked : a) Saint Epiphanius defended her perpetual virginity, *ante partum, in partu, post partum*, against the Antidicomarianites who disputed the last point²³ 6) Judoubted whether Mary had really died but he did not go as far as saying she was immortal³.

4. It is generally said that Epiphanius condemned not only the veneration of images but also their use in the churches. At the time of the Iconoclast controversies the defenders of the orthodox belief were obliged to reject several works which had been falsely attributed to him⁴. It may be wondered whether a certain passage condemning images, found in an indubitably authentic letter of Saint Epiphanius (to John of Jerusalem), was not *interpolated*. A critic recently brought forward proofs⁵ in this sense, but neither Mgr Duchesne nor F. Cavaliere has felt justified in adopting them⁶.

CHAPTER III.

Didymus the Blind.

Special Bibliography.

1. Edition: P. G., 39, 131-1818.

2. Studies: G. Bardy, *Didyme l'Aveugle* (Coll. *Etudes de thiol. hist.*), Paris, 1910. P. Godet, *Didyme l'Aveugle*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 748-755. See also J. Brochet, *Saint Jérôme et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1606. F. Prat, *Origene*, Paris, 1907. F. Diekamp, *Die origenistische Streitigkeiten in sechsten Jahrhundert*, Münster, 1899.

* *Aneor.*, 75.

³ *Haer.*, lxxviii.

³ *Ibid.*, x-xi. The critics are not agreed on the exact meaning of this interesting text.

⁴ S. John Damascene, *Coni. Iconocl.*, I, 25; II, 18. The vth Oecumenical Council had also to reject a number of writings of this nature. Mansi, xiii, 292, sq.

⁵ D. Serruys, in the *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles[^] Lettres*, 1904, p. 360-363. See S. VAILHÉ, *Echos d'Orient*, 1906, p. 222-223. j

⁶ *Hist. Ane. de j'Eglise*, Ht, p. 48. *S. Jérôme*, I, p. 213. Other opinion III J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, ni, p. 445-446.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

Didymus spent his whole life in Alexandria, where he was born in 313. He lost his sight when he was four years old. The learning that he managed to acquire despite this misfortune has always been a source of astonishment both to his contemporaries and to posterity. Thanks to his great application, his long meditation of truths, and his unfailing memory, he acquired, as his disciple Rufinus tells us, a sound knowledge of the philosophical, theological and even the dialectical sciences, together with geometry, astronomy and arithmetic. Saint Athanasius confided to him the direction of the catechetical school. He was the last master of this school, which, at his death, was removed to Side under Rhodo and shortly afterwards closed x. Didymus' infirmity kept him out of the religious controversies. When obliged to treat controverted subjects it was always with great reserve and moderation. He was respected even by the Arians. It should also be remembered that he lived, not in Alexandria itself, but in its neighbourhood where he led a solitary ascetic life 2 like other illustrious doctors of this period. It would not seem that he was ever married. After an uneventful but extremely laborious life, given wholly to prayer and study, he died at Alexandria at the age of eighty-five.

Didymus' chief characteristic, says G. Bardy 3, was his *piety* and his ardent faith. Evidence of this is to be found in his works in the form of long invocations to the Trinity, especially when he finds himself obliged to repeat the blasphematory arguments of his adversaries in order to refute them. "He hardly thinks it possible, moreover, to write well about God without help from on high; he who would discuss theological problems has need of good works, and even more so of great faith, piety and prolonged meditation" *. His was not in any case a brilliant intelligence, productive of original ideas. Saint Jerome, who had lived a month with him, says that his chief faculty was a splendid *memory*. The verbosity and colourlessness of his *style* was probably due to his affliction; the fact that he had always

¹ The date is unknown. — 2 G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 6-8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 10-11. — « *Ibid.*, 11.

Apologia adv. lib. Rufini, II, 27.

to dictate must have militated against conciseness in his work'. In *controversy* he was always calm and measured; The most pronounced trait in his *character* was a sweet and gracious kindness. Like Origen, he was always ready to open wide his arms to strayed sheep returning to the fold. The only enemies to whom he did not yield in the slightest were the Manichaeans.

II. WORKS.

Didymus' writings are of an exegetical and theological nature.

A) Exegesis.

1. His immense exegetical work is almost entirely lost. All that is left of his numerous commentaries¹ may be found in the form of fragments of varying length in the *Catena*. G. Bardy is of the opinion that a "Commentary on the Catholic Epistles", which was generally attributed to him and was the chief specimen of his scriptural works, should be rejected.

2. An idea of his method² may be gained from the extant fragments. Like Origen, the master he preferred, Didymus practised allegorical exegesis. He considered the Scriptures as having two senses, one literal, the other spiritual (he confused the *psychical* with Origen's *spiritual* sense) and, needless to say, he favoured, especially in the Old Testament, the spiritual sense which transcends shadows and figures and attains reality. His allegorism nevertheless was less strict than that of Origen. He found that he could not pass over the *literal* sense when proving the divinity of Jesus Christ or the perfection of His human nature against the Arians. The same motives had already led Saint Athanasius to insist on the historical value and the literal meaning of the Gospels, and even of a certain number of passages in the Old Testament. After him, the Cappodocians began to tread the same path, although they never went as far as the strict literalism of the School of Antioch. As for Didymus, it was especially in the New

¹ On Didymus' style, see G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 55-58.

² He commented, in whole or in part: *a*) in the *Old Testament*: Genesis, Exodus, Kings (bk. i), Isaías, Jeremías, Daniel, Osee, Zacharias, the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Canticle of Canticles, Ecclesiastes; *b*) in the *New Testament*: Saint John, the Acts, the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, and the Catholic Epistles.

³ On the exegesis of Didymus see G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 201-209.

Testament that he had recourse to the literal sense, and even then he never abandoned allegorism entirely.

B) Theological Works.

Of Didymus' equally voluminous theological work only three treatises are extant: *a) On the Holy Ghost*, written before 381; *On the Trinity*, between 380 and 392; *c) Against the Manichaeans*, written at an unknown date. This work has been contested, but, it would seem, on insufficient grounds. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether the *Discourse against Arius and Sabellius*, wrongly attributed to Saint Gregory of Nyssa, was written by Didymus¹.

1. The short treatise *On the Holy Ghost*² in 63 very brief chapters is, as Bardenhewer observes, one of the best of the early works on this subject. Unfortunately, we have only Saint Jerome's Latin translation; the work is well done, but it does not always give a precise enough rendering of the Trinitarian terms and expressions of the original: Saint Jerome³ never failed to identify *ουσία* with *ὑπόστασις*. Didymus proves in this writing that the nature of the Holy Ghost is superior to that of the angels, that He is not created and that He is truly God. He then refuted the objections of the Pneumatomachi. The treatise was composed between 360 and 380.

2. The work *On the Trinity*⁴ in three books, takes up a much firmer attitude against those who deny the divinity of the Holy Ghost, and thus indicates the date of composition to be after 380. First, Didymus takes the divinity of the Father for granted, since it must be admitted by all who recognise the existence of God, and goes on to establish the divinity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, finally answering the objections put by the Arians, and particularly the Macedonians. The author's weaknesses are felt in this writing: "it is a vast compilation, an enormous collection of Scriptural texts and profane fragments; any unity which may be found therein is derived much less from the author's powers of synthesis than from the firmness of his belief"⁵.

3. The treatise *Against the Manichaeans*⁶, in 18 short chapters, turns to be no more than a part of the original work. Didymus uses philosophy to refute the Manichaeans and also explains the Scriptural texts on which they based their teaching. Although this little work is of but secondary importance, it would seem to be authentic. It is well known that Didymus was always preoccupied with fighting Manichaeism, which had done so much damage all around him, even among the clergy, and that he often makes covert references to it in his commentaries.

¹ G., 45, 1281-1302. See G. Barov, *op. cit.*, p. 17-18 and 69-73. The identification of the books mentioned by S. Jerome (*De Viris*, 109), *De Dogmatibus* and *Contra Arianos*, with the two books (4-5) added to Saint basil's three books *Against Eunomius*, is not certain. See G. Barov, *op. cit.*, p. 23-27. — ² P. G., 39, 1031-1086. See G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 19-22.

³ Z., 23, 101-154. See below Chap. xvn; among the works of S. Jerome, *Translations*. — ⁴ P. G., 39, 269-992. See G. Bardy, *ibid.*, p. 28-31.

⁵ G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

⁶ P. G., 39, 1085-1110. See G. Bardy, *ibid.*, p. 33-34.

III. DOCTRINE.

A) Theology.

1. Didymus was primarily a theologian of the Trinity, not only because this doctrine was attacked at the time he was writing but also on account of the large place this dogma occupied in his own pious and Christian life C (His teaching should be taken from the *De Trinitate*; ‡ in the absence of the Greek version of the *De Spiritu Sancto*, this treatise cannot be regarded as reliable). A precise expression which is not found in Saint Athanasius sums up his whole doctrine : *μία ουσία, τρεῖ υποστάσεις* . This formula is to be found for the first time in the fourth century in the *Discourse against Arius and Sabellius*. This writing, however, dates from before 358, and it would not seem that at that date such a formula could have been evolved by an Alexandrian, much less by Didymus who was not given to breaking new ground. It recurs frequently in the *De Trinitate*, but this writing is posterior to 380 and the author thus profited by the teaching of the *Cappadocians* whose work aimed at giving a clear and distinct meaning to the words *ουσία, ὑπόστασις* . There is no doubt that Didymus is really indebted to these great Doctors, even when he invents new expressions for the purpose of affirming the divine unity or of expressing the proper characteristics of the Persons. On the other hand, “although by the use of the expression *μία ουσία, τοῦτ' ὑποστάσει* he shows an advance on *Athanasius*, it cannot be said that he surpasses him by a greater understanding of the concepts expressed in these terms;... even in his last works, his terminology still reveals the same hesitation that was evident in the old tradition of the Alexandrian School ” 34 He remained faithful to the Athanasian method 1.

2. Didymus was never able to free himself entirely from the influence of Origen's teaching: for example, the *creation ab aeterno*, the pre-existence of souls, and perhaps the universal restoration which implied the non-eternity of Hell. His reputation suffered from these lapses. His *teaching*, but not his person, was probably condemned in the fifth Oecumenical Council (553). Thenceforward his name was associated

1 *Ibid.*, p. 59.

2 For the teaching of the *De Trinitate*, see G. BARDY, *ibid.*, p. 73-109.

3 *Ibid.*, So, 81.

4 For his teaching on the *procession* of the Holy Ghost, see ch. IV, p. 438. His testimony to *Peter* will be found in the same chapter, p. 440.

with those of Origen and Evagrius Ponticus and he was subjected to the reprobation of several Fathers and Councils. Moschus (about 620) in his *Spiritual Meadow* (xxvi) sends them all to Hell. And what is more serious, the seventh and eighth (Ecumenical Councils, basing their action on the fifth Council, anathematised them. The disappearance of the greater part of Didymus' writings is explained by these only too well deserved censures.*

B) Spirituality.

Didymus' spirituality also shows considerable traces of Origen's influence, but in this case it is above reproach 2.

1. Wisdom of course is given first place. It still bears the name of *gnosis* or *philosophy*. It is the greatest and the most necessary of the virtues. It is regarded variously as a "mother" which makes of the Christian a child of God; a "spouse" which is united to Him to bring forth all virtue and all righteousness; a "sister" which like wisdom is born of God, for it is written: "Say to Wisdom, Thou art my sister" (*Prov.*, VII, 4).

2. Wisdom, however, is but one element of perfection. There is associated with it another *practical* element which moves the *will* towards good, and which in a sense is even superior to wisdom, for Didymus prefers the piety of the just man, who has but little learning, to the great knowledge of the sinner. This moral perfection supposes, in addition to the avoidance of evil (ακακία), *righteousness* (εὐθὺτη) which is an habitual (ἔξι), peaceful (απαθῶ) and universal principle of action (πάντα ἐνεργοῦμεν) 3.

3. Nevertheless these *two elements in perfection do not constitute* the whole of perfection: for, on the one hand, life supposes in practice the *gnosis* or knowledge, at least in some measure: intention plays a great part in the specification of acts; on the other hand, perfect wisdom cannot be obtained without giving up the possessions of this world and the renouncement of pleasure, in one word, the *ascesis* 4.

4. This last doctrine, which makes real perfection depend on the moral life, does not necessarily imply the philosophical teaching of the pre-eminence of the will, but has a mystical inundation. As G. Bardy observes, in the works of Didymus

1 G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, p. 242-260. — 3 *Ibid.*, 155-161.

The εὐθὺτη is defined: ἔξι καὶ ὅλην ἀπαθῶ πάντα ἐνεργοῦμεν, dispositio vi cuius impassibiliter (?) omnia operamur.

* G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, 157-159.

may be found an "intense mysticism" in concordance with tradition¹; it is especially manifested by the way in which the Christian's union with Christ, the Spouse of all holy souls, is conceived. Such souls become the throne or the temple of God and even the name of God or Christ may be applied to them. They are gifted with special graces. Didymus defines the perfect Christian as "one who possesses true knowledge of the relations of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost"

CHAPTER IV.

The Cappadocian Fathers.

This Chapter is divided into five articles.

ARTICLE I.—SAINT BASIL. LIFE AND WORKS.

Special Bibliography.

1. Edition: P. G., 29-32 (Garnier Maran's edit., 1721-1730).
2. Studies: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, t. ix (1714), p. 1-304 and 628-691. P. Allard, *Saint Basile* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1899; *Basile (saint)* in *Diet, théol.*, 441-455. E. FIALON, *Etude littéraire sur saint Basile*. Paris, 1861. L. Roux, *Etude sur la prédication de Basile le Grand*, Strasbourg, 1867. Vasson, *Saint Basile le Grand, ses œuvres oratoires et ascétiques*. Paris, 1894. J. Rivière, *Saint Basile, évêque de Césarée* (Coll. *Les moralistes chrétiens*), Paris, 1925. Wittig, *Leben... des hl. Basil, d. Gr. von C.*, Friburg im B., 1920. See also Fessler-Jungmann, *op. cit.*, I, p. 491-532. F. Cavallera, *Le schisme et Antioche*, Paris, 1905 (*passim*). P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique*, p. 85-115.

I. LIFE OF SAINT BASIL (330-379).—HIS CHARACTER.

A) Before the episcopate.

Saint Basil was born at Caesarea, in Cappadocia, about 330, of rich and deeply Christian parents. His father was an orator and an advocate; his mother was renowned for her virtue. His maternal grandfather had been a martyr, and Macrina, his grand-mother on his father's side, had been a

¹ *Ibid.*, 160. — - *Ibid.*, 157.

disciple of Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus in Pontus. His eldest sister, Macrina, also lived the life of a saint on her lands at Annesi which she had turned into a monastery * Two other brothers were, like Basil himself, destined to become bishops, Gregory at Nyssa and Peter at Sebaste.

He received his first lessons from his father at Neo-Caesarea. He then went to finish his literary education, first at Caesarea², then at Constantinople, and finally at Athens, in which town he remained for four or five years, it was here that he formed a close friendship with his compatriot, Gregory Nazianzen, whom he had already met at Caesarea and who had gone before him to Athens. On his return to Cappadocia in 356 he spent some time successfully in teaching rhetoric, but in a number of conversations with his sister Macrina he learnt the vanity of human things, and was converted ³ and baptised (357) ⁴.

It was at this same period that Macrina had founded the monastic life at Annesi. Basil, moved by grace, thought of imitating her, but first he desired to know more of this way of life. Besides the disciples of Eustathius of Sebaste ⁵, in Cappadocia, he visited the great solitaries of Egypt, Syria and Mesopotamia. On his return he gave all his possessions to the poor and went to live in solitude on the banks of the Iris, opposite Annesi, near Neo-Caesarea. He was soon joined by other fervent Christians who also aspired to perfection. He grouped them according to the *monastic rule* of Saint Pachomius, although the monasteries he founded were less numerous. He gave to them a wise rule of life and provided for their moral and ascetical direction by the Longer Rules which date from this period, and later by the Shorter Rules which were probably composed while he was a priest at Caesarea. These two Rules soon acquired a widespread popularity and earned their author the title of

¹ See biography of Saint Macrina by E. Bouvy, in *Rev. August.*, 1, 265-288.

² Caesarea of Palestine according to Tillemont; Caesarea of Cappadocia according to Maran.

³ This was not properly speaking a conversion to Christianity, but a new solution to tend to perfection.

⁴ In the fourth century the custom of postponing baptism existed even in the most Christian families, although infant baptism was in the true tradition of the Church. At a later date Saint Basil condemned the new custom in Sermon XLII. Saint Gregory of Nyssa also wrote a short treatise *Adversus eos qui baptismum differunt*. P. L., 46, 415-432.

⁵ See above, p. 318.

the lawgiver of Oriental monasticism Study was added to prayer and manual labour. Origen was in great favour, as may be seen from the *Philocalia* (an Origenist anthology) composed in collaboration by Basil and Gregory Nazianzen during the latter's short visit to the solitaries of Iris about 360.

Basil remained for about five years in retirement. He was as yet no more than a *lector*. Eusebius, the new Bishop of Caesarea (362-370), desirous of enlisting the services of such an eminent man, ordained him priest shortly after 362. It was not long, however, before Basil was forced to leave him, for the influence he obtained at Caesarea had excited the bishop's jealousy. But Eusebius recalled him about 365 and found in him a prudent counsellor in his controversy with Valens, and confided to him most of the work which the administration of the diocese entailed. Meanwhile Basil continued to lead the austere life of a monk. In 368, during a famine which ravaged Cappadocia, he distributed to the needy all that remained of his possessions. Finally, he was elected to succeed Eusebius in spite of Arian opposition in the town. He was then forty years old.

B) Episcopate (370-379).

I. Despite the short duration of his episcopate, Basil's pastoral activities were extremely fertile, for they were both firm and energetic and took on many forms. He organised the *monastic life* in Cappadocia as he had done in Pontus. He settled the functions of the various *orders of clergy* of Caesarea. The "liturgy" (Canon of the Mass), which bears his name, probably owes a lot to him, in spite of the modifications it has undergone in the course of centuries². In this he was probably continuing work that he had begun while yet a priest³. His *charitable establishment*[®]

² See P. Allard, *Did. thiol.*, 447, and chiefly the life, *Si. Basile*, ch. V, p. 34.

³ According to the critics, "the original gist of the *Anaphora* (Canon of the Mass), which bears his name, must be attributed to him, on condition that his literary contribution is limited to the prayer of the liturgy alone and that the movable parts capable of modification are excluded". De Mester, *Grecques (liturgi)* in *Did. Arch.*, col. 1604. See *ibid.*, 1595-1604. The "Liturgy", which on very slender grounds is ascribed to Saint John Chrysostom, should be regarded as independent of that of Saint Basil, *Ibid.*, 1596-1598.

⁴ A liturgical initiative which seems to be due to Saint Basil before he was a priest (*Regula fusius tractata*, q. 37) was the institution of *compline* as a canonical hour. The argument for this is given by Pargol in *Rev. d'hist. M. lilt. rei.*, 1898, p. 281-288 and 456-467. See A. Vandepitte, in *Rev. -/«* 1903, p. 258-264. E. Fehrenbach, *Complies*, in *Did. Arch.*, col. 2466-2470.]

(schools of arts and industries, orphanages, lazar-house, retreat-house) formed almost another town on the outskirts of Caesarea x. Lastly, he completed the religious instruction of his people by his *sermons*, in which the richness of the matter is combined with a classical beauty of form. In the whole of Cappadocia and beyond, Saint Basil was held in the greatest esteem. Was it for this reason that in 371 Valens had this province divided up? Such may have been the case. It is a fact that the Archbishop of Tyana, capital of Cappadocia Secunda, was desirous of taking Basil's place as metropolitan bishop. In an endeavour to *defend the rights* of his Church in so far as it was possible, Basil sent as bishops his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory Nazianzen, to Sasima, on the limits of his territory. The latter, however, never made up his mind to go, while the former was so unfitted to diocesan administration that a number of difficulties arose from which Basil was eventually to suffer.

2. Doctrinal action. Great as he was as a bishop, Basil showed himself greater still *in his fight with Arianism*.

After Constantius' death a certain *revival* of Nicene orthodoxy made itself felt in that Oriental episcopate which had previously given way so cowardly to the imperial demands, and signed all the formulas. Among the chief supporters of this new movement in favour of Nicaea was Meletius of Antioch, and there was a certain number in Asia Minor. A rapid and universal return to the Nicene faith, however, was not easy of accomplishment; it was hindered by the policy of the new emperor, Valens, the prejudice, current among the Alexandrians and in the East, against the *ζυμοθόσιον*, and the internal difficulties of the Churches, especially the schism in the Church of Antioch which alone by its example might have persuaded those who hung back. Saint Basil always adhered openly to Nicaea. Moreover, his high position (Caesarea was the real metropolis of Asia Minor), together with his eminent intellectual and moral reputation, enabled him to speak authoritatively to the entire Oriental episcopate. And the part he was called upon to play was in truth providential.

First he refused to cede to imperial exactions regarding the faith. His replies to the Emperor Valens and to his *elect*, Modestus, have rendered him an illustrious example *if* those eminent churchmen who ever defended the Church against the encroachments of the State 2. That he met with

1 See P. Allard, *Saint Bastie*, p. 109-in.

His dialogue with Modestus, Prætorian prefect and a fanatical Arian (he *inu*cd eighty-four of the clergy to be burned alive on a vessel at Constantinople), *I* preserved by Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat.* XLIII, 48-51. Threatened with exile, *ll.til* replied: "I belong to no place; this earth in which I live is not mine;

success is proved by the fact that Valens ceased to persecute him. He left him unmolested in the possession of his diocese and later sent him on a mission to Armenia.

As for *doctrinal* difficulties, Basil solved them (in his treatises and his letters) by accepting both the formula of three hypostases, so dear to the Orientals, and the $\delta\mu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omega$ which was preferred at Alexandria ¹.

In order to put an end to the doctrinal differences which were rife in the Eastern Churches, Basil counted on help from the West and in particular from the Pope, who, he hoped, would give his support to Meletius of Antioch. It is probable also that he thought of asking the emperor Valentinian to use his influence with Valens. He wrote of this matter first to Saint Athanasius ², but without result. He then wrote to Pope Damasus ³ and received in return an encouraging letter. When he again approached Rome he was promised support only on condition that he sent a qualified episcopal delegation. This was a bitter blow to Basil ⁴. Shortly afterwards Damasus openly sponsored the cause of Paulinus, much to Basil's expressed disappointment (375). The bitterness with which he had received the Pope's decision gradually wore off, and two years latter (377) he again wrote to the Pope asking that he should withdraw his support from Paulinus and condemn Apollinaris ⁵, against whom Basil was forced to defend the traditional faith. In spite of many setbacks this made steady progress, and although Basil did not live to see its final triumph in 381, he had at least the joy of seeing peace restored to the Eastern Church by Valens' successor. Saint Basil died on the 1st January, 379.

C) Character.

Saint Basil was called *Great* even by his contemporaries⁶ and the Greek Church places him among the most eminent

I should be in my own place in whatever country to which I was sent. I know that the whole earth is God's, and wherever I may be, I consider myself a stranger and a pilgrim". Modestus having said: "Never until this day have I beqjj spoken to with so much freedom", he replied: "That is perhaps because yoll have never yet met a bishop!"

¹ See below, art. v, *Doctrine*.

² *Epist.*, 67, 69. — ³ *Epist.*, 60. — ⁴ *Epist.*, 138, 156.

⁵ *Epist.* 263. All Saint Basil's letters relating to the schism of Antioch itti dealt withat length by F. C a v a l l e r a, *op. cit.*, *passim*, p. 187-188. For B.r.ili general attitude to this question see art. v, *Doctrine*, *Church*.

of its "oecumenical" Doctors. (The others are Saint Gregory Nazianzen and Saint John Chrysostomus). Saint Athanasius had been a fighter and Saint John Chrysostom was unequalled as a moralist, but the predominant trait in Basil's character seems to have been a harmonious abundance of the most varied talents. The Church has possessed few men so gifted and so well balanced. He combined in a rare measure the genius of Rome and that of Greece. He was at the same time a man of doctrine, whose clear and precise teaching gave the tone to an entire generation, and a man of action of strong character who knew what he wanted and resolutely took the means of obtaining his ends. He was a *believer* who never wavered in his faith, yet his faith never lessened the *classical* culture he had absorbed as a youth. When needful he could be the *philosopher*, combat an error, give an exact definition and make a necessary distinction: as an *orator* he drew his force from his gift of mixing with all kinds of men, knowing how to talk to them and how to lead them. The ensemble of these qualities enabled Saint Basil to exercise a considerable influence, and Paul Allard, his latest biographer, rightly regards him as eminently a leader of men by virtue of his ideas, his oratorical powers and his wise directives. Although well equipped for speculative studies his natural bent was moral teaching. From a *literary point of view* he was the most classical of all the Greek Fathers; he had less warmth of expression than Chrysostomus, while Gregory Nazianzen was more lyrical, but a noble and elegant simplicity may always be found in his easy, natural and learned style.

II. WORKS OF SAINT BASIL.

A) Ascetic Works.

Saint Basil's ascetic work is chiefly composed of three writings: the *Moralia*, the *Longer Rule* and the *Shorter Rule*. To these may be added two undoubtedly authentic short treatises or sermons (*De judicio* and *De fide*). It is possible that the *three sermons* which precede them and which open the collection of Basil's ascetic writings, concerning Christian life in general, renunciation of the world and the duties of the monk, are authentic, but this is doubted by the critics. On the other hand, the monastic *penitential* and the collection of monastic *con-*

¹ T. Allard, *Diet. thiol.*, col. 444-445.

² They are edited with the *Moralia*, to which they serve as an introduction: *J. G.*, 31, 653-676, 675-692.

³ *J. G.*, 31, 619-626; 625-648; 647-652.

stitutions which are found after the Rules in present editions, must be rejected

1. The *Moralia* Ἔθικά (τὰ ἠθικά) are a simple collection of Scriptural texts, drawn for the most part from the Gospels and the Epistles. They are arranged in the form of chapters and preceded by a brief synopsis which serves as an introduction and commentary. The chapters themselves are grouped as a series of *Rules*. The work contains eighty Rules in all. These precepts are not especially applicable to the special obligations of monks, but to all Christians and pastors of the Churches.

2. The *Longer Rules* ('Οποὶ κατὰ πλάτος), composed between 358 and 362 are not a monastic Rule in the ordinary sense of the word, but rather a synopsis of fifty-five lectures which treat the most important aspects of the religious life according to the Scriptures. They elaborate *principles* which are of capital importance, for it was on these principles that monastic life in Cappadocia and Roman Asia was built up.

The *Shorter Rules* ('Οποὶ κατ' ἐπιτομήν.) which number 313, are, like the foregoing but in a briefer form, a series of answers to questions on the religious life. They may be compared to solutions to cases of conscience. In this work the author deals chiefly with the *applications* of the principles. This work was probably written at Caesarea before Basil became a bishop.

"Both these collections", says P. Allard, "are the development of ideas expressed by Saint Basil in a letter he wrote to his friend Gregory, in which he describes the life led by himself and his first companions in Pontus".

Saint Basil's *influence* on the monastic life was considerable, but it must be well understood. It chiefly consisted in the spreading of a limited cenobitism, which little by little prevailed throughout the whole of the East, and also in the diffusion of his *ascetic writings*, consisting of well founded, solid and serious spirituality, which was welcomed especially by cultivated minds; such is the great teaching of the "Rules". It would be incorrect, however, to give a juridical sense to this word, for Saint Basil did not compose a rule in the strict meaning which is given to this term in the West. He did not found an Order. Byzantine monks, both before and after the schism, are not and never called themselves *Basilians*. All their monasteries are autonomous and do

* P. G., 31, 1305-1316, 1321-1428. The treatise *De vera virginitate*, attributed to Saint Basil, is preferably to be ascribed to Basil of Ancyra. See above p. 377. — 2 P. G., 31, 699-870.

3 P. G., 31, 889-1052. They are preceded by two more *Ascetical Discourses* 869-888. — 4 P. G., 31, 1051-1306. — 5 P. G., 32, 223-233.

4 The uneducated monks (probably the majority) preferred less austere writings of an anecdotal and legendary character.

5 The Catholic *Orders of Basilians* were canonically erected at a later date, I

not even possess that bond of a "common rule" which forms the chief element of unity in the Benedictine Order in the West. Although more of a moral than a juridical nature, Saint Basil's influence was not the less fruitful in the East, and even in the West where it was notably forwarded by Cassian.

B) Homiletic Works.

These are : *a*) nine sermons on the Hexaemeron; *y*) thirteen sermons on the Psalms; *c*) a collection of twenty-four discourses on various subjects, all of which are authentic except the 2nd and the 17th. AU other sermons attributed to him are undoubtedly apocryphal except two which are doubtful.

The sermons on the Hexaemeron, that is to say, on the creation of the world "in six days", are, like the sermons on the Psalms, an exegetical work, not, as P. Allard remarks, "in the modern meaning of textual criticism" but in that of a "religious commentary", Basil attempts to describe the creation by developing and explaining the text of Genesis (I, 1-26), rejecting all allegorical interpretation and keeping strictly to the letter. "He combines with his theme excellent lessons on popular philosophy,... (and) from the imperfect scientific knowledge of his time draws out a most elevated and delicate Christian spirituality" ³. He holds up to admiration the wisdom of God as it is seen in the created world. These sermons became very popular, even in the West, where they were imitated by Saint Ambrose. Saint Basil's work comes to an end with the fifth day, but Saint Gregory of Nyssa completed his work by adding a sermon on the creation of man ⁴. These sermons were preached at Caesarea during a week of Lent while Basil was still a priest.

The thirteen sermons on the Psalms §(Ps. 1, 7, 14, 28, 29, 32, 33, 44, 45, 48, 59, 61, 114, Septuagint) alone are regarded as authentic. Although the author comments them verse by verse, his purpose was to edify his faithful by moral applications. The first is a study on the Psalms in general. These sermons also appear to have been composed while Basil was a priest. They have been imitated by Saint Ambrose.

■ Saint Augustine composed similar works which cover the whole of the Psalter.

¹ On this subject see J. Pargoire, *Basile de Césarée (saint) et Basilicas*, in *Did. Arch.*, col. 501-510.

³ *J. G.*, 29, 3-308.

⁴ P. Allard, *Diet. thiol.*, col. 445-446.

⁵ *De hominis opificio* : P. G., 44. 125-256.

G., 29, 209-494.

In the collection of 24 sermons Basil treats several *dogmatist* subjects (15, De fide; 16, de Verbo Incarn.; 24, Against the Sabellianit, Anus and the Eunomians; etc.), but for the most part deals with *moral subjects* and charity in particular: the sixth sermon against usurem is well known; sermon 22 on the study of Pagan classics' shows that "great profit may be found in them, even for the understanding of the Scriptures"³ lastly, four of these sermons consist of *panegyrics*' (5, 18, 19, 23). The 17th on Saint Barlaam appears to have been composed by Saint John Chrysostomus.

C) Dogmatic Works.

These consist of two treatises against the Arians; a writing against the Manichaeans, mentioned by Saint Augustine', is lost.

The chief of these works is the treatise Against Eunomius⁶, in three books (Books IV and V in present editions are apocryphal)⁷, composed about 364. The Arianism of Eunomius was pure rationalism; he considered that the essence of God was innascibility (hence the Word cannot be the true Son of God), and that this essence may be comprehended perfectly by man. Saint Basil refuted him directly in book I; book II establishes the divinity of the Son and His consubstantiality with the Father, while the third book deals with the divinity of the Holy Ghost.

The work on the Holy Ghost⁸ was written in 375, when the Bishop was being reproached for his use of the doxology: "Glory be to the Father *-with* the Son and the Holy Ghost", in place of the traditional formula: "Glory be to the Father *by* the Son *in* the Holy Ghost". After having devoted several chapters to the importance of words used in theology, Basil demonstrates against Arians of all shades of opinion that the same honour should be given to the Son and the Holy Ghost as is given to the Father, since they have one and the same nature as the Father. He avoided, however, the more trenchant formulas so as not to go farther than the Council of Nicaea (which did not apply the *ζμoοὺσω*

¹ P. G., 31, 163-619.

' This should be regarded perhaps more as a short treatise than as a sermon.

³ Fénelon, *Dialogues sur l'Eloquence*, in.

⁴ On St. Julitta, 5; St. Gordius, 18; tire *Forty Martyrs of Sebaste*, 19; and St. Mamas, 23, respectively. The panegyric on the forty martyrs is particularly celebrated and has inspired many hymns. See the *Rev. Aug.*, 1903 (t. ill), p. 267-274. — ³ *Contra Jul.*, I, 16.

⁶ P. G., 29, 497-774. See l'. Allard, *O' Basile* (vie), p. 193-196.

' Perhaps composed by Didymus the Blind. See G. Bardv, *Didyme PAveugle*, p. 23-27. — ³ P. G., 32, 87-218. See P. Allard, *ibid.*, 197-200. |

to the Holy Ghost) and in order not to annoy his adversaries uselessly.

D) Letters

365 letters are contained in Saint Basil's correspondence (1-46 before the episcopate; 47-291 during the episcopate; 292-365 of uncertain <latea>). The following must be treated as apocryphal : the correspondence between Basil and Libanius (Ep. 333-359), the letters to Julian the Apostate (39, 40, 41, 360), and possibly the letters to Apollinaris (361, 363)'. The greater part of this correspondence is of capital interest. The most diverse subjects are treated. The letters written while the saint was a bishop are particularly instructive from a historical, doctrinal and disciplinary standpoint. Special mention may be made of three of the letters addressed to Amphilochius of Iconium (233, 234, 235) which form a theological complement to the books against Eunotius; and three others, 188, 199, 217, called the *Canonical Epistles*, which have been incorporated in Oriental Canon Law; they make regulations for the performance of public penance* according to the degree of guilt. The letters he wrote to the Churches of the West are also important on account of the schism of Antioch s.

Perhaps in no other part of his work is Saint Basil's style so perfect as in his letters, and it is certain that nowhere else is better revealed the fine temper of his mind and that multitude of gifts which has been so admired by posterity.

ARTICLE II. SAINT GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS. LIFE AND WORKS.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: P. G., 36-38.

2. Studies: A. Benoit, *S. Grégoire de Nazianze, sa vie, ses œuvres et son époque*, Paris, 1876. E. Dubedout, *De D. Gregorii Naz. carminibus*, Paris, 1901. M. Guignet, *Saint Grégoire de Naz., orateur et épistolier*, Paris, 1911; two combined studies. See also Fessler-JUNGSMANN, *op. cit.*, I, p. 532-564. P. Godet, *Grégoire de Nazianze i aint* in *Diet, théol.*, col 1839-1844. F. MartroyÈ, *Le Testament de tint Grégoire de Nazianze*, in the *Mémoires de la Soc. nut. des Antiquaires de Er.*, t. 76, 47 pages, Paris, 1924. F. Cavallera, *Le schisme /i'Antioche*, Paris, 1905 (*passim*). E. BOUVY, *Les manuscrits des iiscours de Saint Grégoire de Naz.*, in *Rev. Aug.*, I (1902), p. 222-237.

l P. G., 32, 219-1112. See Bessières, *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de saint Basile*, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 6 articles from 1919 to 1922. — * A few others have been discovered since the Maurist's edition.

' Letter 8 is to be attributed to Evagrius Ponticus.

4. See art. V, his teaching concerning penance and marriage.

See above, the Life of S. Basil, and below, art. V, teaching of the Cappadocians on the Church.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

A) His life before the episcopate.

Saint Gregory is said to be of Nazianzus, although he was not born in this little Cappadocian town (he was born at the neighbouring town of Arianzus) nor was he ever its bishop: it was his father who was bishop of Nazianzus. Like Saint Basil, Gregory was born about the year 330. His father, and especially Nonna, his mother, were careful that he received a sound Christian education, although as was the custom at that time he was not baptised. After having attended the schools at Caesarea¹ and Alexandria, he went to Athens, where he was rejoined by Basil whose acquaintance he had already made. At the end of his studies Gregory stayed on in Athens, where he gave lessons in Rhetoric. He returned to Cappadocia about 359, was baptised and went to join his friend in solitude on the banks of the Iris. There he combined study with his ascetical exercises, and interested himself more especially in the works of Origen; the *Philocalia*, written about 360, is a proof of their mutual admiration for the master.

Soon, however, Gregory's father sent for his son to aid him in the administration of the diocese and found in him a devoted helper until his death in 374. Things did not always run smoothly, however. When the Bishop wished to ordain his son priest in 362, the latter consented with great reluctance, so much so in fact that shortly afterwards he took refuge with Basil in Pontus. He came back only when it was necessary for him to help his father to repress a schism in his Church². The old bishop, little versed in theological subtilties (he was converted as an old man and had almost immediately been made bishop), had been weak enough or imprudent enough to sign the Homoean formula of Rimini-Constantinople. In consequence there was a strong party to oppose him. Gregory persuaded his father to make a purely Catholic profession of faith, thus satisfying everyone and restoring peace in the diocese (about 364). In 371, Basil, desirous, of creating a bishopric at Sasimess, as an offset to

¹ Probably Caesarea of Palestine. See above, art. i, S. Basil.

² Several critics place the date of this schism and its repression about 359-360.

• See above, p. 409.

the usurpations of Anthimus, Archbishop of Tyana, appealed to Gregory, who although unwilling allowed himself to be consecrated. Soon, however, he was again swayed by his passion for solitude and fled secretly to a house of retreat to weep over his lost freedom. He forgave his friend later, but always regretted having been forced into the episcopate. He also complained that he was again torn away from his solitary life by his father's white hairs. It would not seem, however, that he ever took up his post at Sasimes[†].

B) Bishop of Constantinople.

After the deaths of his mother and father in 374, Gregory was at last able to give himself up entirely to the contemplative life. He withdrew to the monastery of Saint Thecla at Seleucia in Isauria. It was here in 378, after the death of Valens, that the Catholics of Constantinople came to beg him to restore the orthodox faith in their town. Saint Basil pressed him to accept this invitation. He yielded to these appeals in 379 and opened a little church in the house of one of his kinsmen where he was given the faithful support of the orthodox Catholics of the town. His virtue and his eloquence soon attracted many serious listeners, and it seemed as if the Church of Constantinople, which for forty years had been oppressed by Arian intrigue and violence, was to rise again in that tiny sanctuary. Gregory himself had been inspired to give the name of Resurrection (Ἀνάσ-ις.) to his chapel. It was here that he preached his most famous sermons, notably his discourses on the Trinity, which have since earned for him the title of theologian. By his admirable eloquence he soon won over to his faith the educated and cultured classes of the town². But the Arians placed every possible hindrance in his way. He was extremely discouraged by the attempted intrusion of Maximus the Cynic in the See of Constantinople³. Fortunately this attempt was not successful since Theodosius repulsed Maximus and himself conducted Gregory to Saint Sophia, where

1. For details of this incident see P. Allard, *Saint Basile*, p. 91-94.

2. About this time Saint Jerome came to pursue his biblical studies in Constantinople (379-382) under Saint Gregory's tuition, whom he always considered as his spiritual father [praeceptor meus]. See F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme*, Paris, 1922, i, p. 59-62.

3. Saint Gregory was almost decided to retire, but was persuaded to change his mind by the words: "If you leave us, you take the Trinity with you"; *Carni, de vita*, V. 1100.

he was acclaimed Bishop of the town by the clergy and the people. He himself was not satisfied with this summary induction and insisted later on having himself formally recognised by the Council newly convoked at Constantinople.

This Council opened in May 381 before the arrival of the Egyptian and Macedonian bishops, and lasted for three months. At its inception it was composed only of the prelates of Syria and the Eastern regions of Asia Minor, which had been but recently converted to Nicene orthodoxy. Most of them supported the formula of the three hypostases, which was regarded, not altogether wrongly in Basil's opinion, as the necessary complement of the Nicene "consubstantial". In consequence, nearly all of them harboured a certain animosity against the Egyptians and the Westerns. Moreover "personal jealousies caused a state, if not of schism, at least of strained relations which had no vestige of doctrinal foundation. The keenest mind in the whole assembly, the illustrious Gregory of Nazianzus, was well aware of this situation and the dangers to which it was capable of giving rise".*

The Council, which by virtue of its convocation and celebration was only a General Council of the East, had in order to put an end to the Trinitarian controversies and the vexed questions of the schism of Antioch and the See of Constantinople. An agreement was quickly reached on the last point: Gregory was recognised as Bishop and enthroned by Meletius of Antioch. Shortly afterwards Meletius died and the question of the Church of Antioch became even more difficult of solution. Gregory and other reasonable members of the Council proposed that Paulinus should be recognised, a solution which would have put an end to the schism *ipso facto*: but Paulinus was supported by the West, he was rejected and Flavian was nominated.

After the death of Meletius, Gregory was called upon to preside the Council, either on account of his great personal reputation or because of the immediate application of Canon 1, which was adopted at this time, and which assured to the See of Constantinople a precedence of honour in the East. It would appear that Gregory was not particularly fitted to govern an assembly of whose spirit and tendencies he did not

* Mgr. Duchesne, *Eglises syriennes*, p. 178.

a See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 246-255.

improve.* On several occasions he made up his mind to withdraw. When the Egyptian and Macedonian bishops arrived, representing contrary tendencies, they did not realise that Gregory was really their best friend, and had the unfortunate idea of opposing his elevation to the See of Constantinople. This was the last straw; the unhappy bishop resigned at once, and having addressed a most touching farewell to the Church of Constantinople which he had loved so well, he returned to Cappadocia (June 381).

For some time after this Saint Gregory administered the diocese of Nazianzus which was still vacant. And when, two years later (383), he gave it a bishop in the person of Eulalius, he withdrew to his property at Arianzus, where he spent *his last years*. It is at this period that he wrote his poems. He died in 389 or 390.

C) The Character of Saint Gregory.

It is usual to oppose him to Saint Basil and nothing is more easy than to show the differences between these two men. Too much insistence on this point, however, might lead to an unjust appreciation of Gregory. There is no doubt that he was not apt for the active life, nor capable of sustaining the stress of combat. He was hesitating and undecided, impressionable and sensitive, easily hurt, especially by his best friends when they were forced to make themselves exacting. He suffered even more from the vulgarity and ugliness of the baser sort. The chief trait in his character was his nobility of soul. His desires were wholly set on a sublime but in no way vain ideal, an ideal which he was more inclined to admire and persuade others to admire than to force others towards its realisation by striving with all the obstacles which stood in the way. He combined with these intiments a certain simplicity which left him open to deception. He was generous³ to a degree and absolutely unselfish, even in his greatest hours of success⁴. His very

I I Certain prelates were "very proud" of having discovered the famous argument of climates: "Not in the West but in the East the Saviour was born." "And in the East that He was killed" replied the bishop. L. DUCHESNE, *ibid.* [In Gr kg. Naz., *Carmen de vita*, verses 1690-1700.

Omt. 42: *Supremum Tate*. See in particular the splendid peroration.

I ' See his *Testament*.

I I The Sunday he provoked the applause of his auditors by his explanation in the expression *sabbatum secundo-primum* (Luke, VI, I), in order to demonstrate to Saint Jerome the worthlessness of incompetent approbation. A critic

real zeal led him on more than one occasion to sacrifice the sweetness of the contemplative life which had such great attractions for him. No doubt that in the solitude of the cloister or at the head of a peaceful diocese, surrounded by men who understood him, he would have given of his best and exercised the powerful doctrinal influence for which he was so admirably gifted.

He has rightly been given the name of the Theologian. Nevertheless this word must not be taken too literally as possessing the speculative connotation it now bears. Gregory had but little inclination for purely philosophical discussion. He was a theologian after the *manner of the Fathers*. A firm sense of tradition saved him from coming to grief as many of Origen's followers had done. His *style* was rich, harmonious and pure, both clear and precise, well adapted to the expression of vigorous thought. That was perhaps his greatest talent, in conjunction with his eloquence, which although it was less ardent than that of Chrysostomus was rendered no less captivating by the limpidity of the matter and the brilliance of the form. He was pre-eminently a *theologian-orator*.

It was natural that he should take pleasure in Origen's mystical idealism. Although he was unable, as others had done, to find therein the strength of soul to overcome the defects of his temperament, he nevertheless learned submission to suffering and an enthusiastic admiration of punishment, of that substantial light which is the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, a light which he himself says cannot be comprehended unless we ourselves become light, by the purification of the soul, passing from fear to wisdoms. It can hardly be doubted that such thoughts, which are to be found throughout his sermons, are the expression of his own experience and the true portrait of his saintly life.

II. WORKS OF SAINT GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS.

Saint Gregory's works may be classed under three heads: *Sermons, Poems and Letters*.

(GrUtzschnacker) writing on this incident speaks of learned and proud charlatans thereby showing that he has understood neither the delicacy of the bishop nor that of Saint Jerome who narrates the episode (Ep. 52, 8). See F. Cavalloni, *Saint Jérôme*, I, p. 60.

1 *Orat.* 31, c. 3.

2 *Orat.* 40, c. 37, 38. Lumen efficiamur. Illuminemur oculis, ut recte dei vultum

3 *Orat.* 39, c. 8.

Io Sermons The 45 extant discourses are masterpieces of eloquence and doctrine. From the latter point of view sermons 27-31, entitled theological discourses (οἱ τῆ θεολογία λόγοι)² by the author and preached at Constantinople in 380 against the Arians, are of especial interest. In the *first* (27), a prefatory discourse, Gregory takes up a firm stand against the Eunomians and explains the qualities which should be found in one whose duty it is to speak of God, and also the conditions which qualify such a one to speak; in the *second* (28) he proves the existence, the nature and the attributes of God, insists on His incomprehensibility (against Eunomius) and explains the origin of idolatry; in the *third* (29) he demonstrates the equality of the Three Persons and the divinity and consubstantiality of the Son in particular, and gives an answer to Eunomius' fallacies, as Saint Basil had also done in the first two books of his treatise 3; in the *fourth* (30) he gives the true meaning of the Scriptural texts objected by the Arians; and, finally, in the *fifth* (31) he proves from Scripture, from tradition and by his answer to the objections of the Pneumatomachi, that the Holy Ghost is a divine Person, not engendered as is the Son, but existing by virtue of a procession (ὁκπόρευσι, ἐκπεμψι) whose nature we ignore.

Two other discourses (20 and 23), consecrated to the qualifications of a theologian, may be assimilated to the foregoing. In these, Gregory condemns in particular the *theological mania* of the Orientals. This is the main theme of *discourse 32* (on moderation in argument) : the author «how» that not all men should discuss God indiscriminately; laymen especially should abstain from such discussions, both on account of the danger of error and the little spiritual advantage which thereby ensues⁴. The *20th discourse* demands that those who would discuss theology should have a knowledge of the Scriptures and lead a holy life. The preacher then attacks Sabellius and Arius, affirms the unity of the nature of God, and the Trinity of Persons, shows how divine generation differs from human generation, and advises theologians to be on their guard against any indiscreet curiosity regarding the generation of the Son and the procession of the Holy Ghosts.

The remaining discourses deal with the most varied subjects : *a) Sermons on the feasts* (the Nativity, 38; Epiphany, 39; Easter, 40; Pentecost, 41 ; etc.) ; *b) panegyrics of the saints* (Saint Cyprian

² <1> 3S-36. — * *P. G.*, 36, 11-172.

³ The greater part of it is translated by E. Amann, *Le dogme catholique, dans V Pires*, p. 196-206. — * *P. G.*, 36, 173-212.

⁴ * *G.*, 35, 1065-1082. This discourse is entitled *De dogmate et constitutione dogmorum*. The second part of the title is only justified by a number of vague allusions made by the author to this subject.

of Antioch, 24; Saint Athanasius, 21); *c*) *funeral orations* (for his father Gregory, 18; his brother Caesarius, 7; his sister Gorgonia, 8; Saint Basil, 43); it was Saint Gregory who initiated this kind of sermon in the Church and adopted the rules of the Pagan *encomia*; *d*) two *invectives* (λόγοι σπηλιτεστικοί) against Julian the Apostate (4 and 5), which were composed in 362, after the death of this prince, and which were probably never preached; *e*) *moral sermons* (on the love of the poor, 14, peace, 22, 23); *f*) *occasional sermons*, often concerning himself and explaining his conduct in various matters. A number of these are justly famous.

In the most important of these occasional sermons, the second entitled *On his Flight*, which was composed after his ordination to the priesthood and his return to his father, Gregory gives a veritable treatise (117 chaps.) on the dignity of the priesthood; in this he was imitated by Saint John Chrysostomus in his work "On the Priesthood", and by Gregory the Great in his "Pastoral". Discourses 9, 10 and it deal with the circumstances of his elevation to the *episcopate* *va* 371. The 36th was preached at Constantinople shortly after the attempted intrusion of Maximus and Gregory's official *enthroning* at Saint Sophia. Lastly, the 42nd, a real model of rhetorical skill, was also preached at Constantinople, in the presence of 150 bishops assembled in the town, on the occasion of *his resignation*; he explains his motives and speaks of his work in that town which he had converted, bidding a touching farewell to all those he had loved in Christ.⁸

2° Saint Gregory's Poems have either an apostolic or an apologetic purpose. They are grouped in six classes in two books. Book I contains the *dogmatical* poems, of which there are 38, and the *moral* poems, of which there are 40, mostly treating of virginity. Book II is especially valuable inasmuch as it treats in 99 poems of the author himself (the second, *De vita sua*, which contains 1949 lines, is a splendid autobiography), and contains eight poems "*On the Others*"; there is also a number of *epitaphs* (129) and *epigrams* (94). A long tragedy, entitled *Christus Patiens*, has also been attributed to Saint Gregory, but this is in reality a Byzantine work of the twelfth century. The critics are agreed in saying that although the poet's inspiration is often hampered in his didactic works, in which he was chiefly preoccupied with combating the heretics and especially the Apollinarists, the personae poems on the other hand are full of a charm which is an outcome of their natural grace and the deep and melancholy sentiments which Gregory's sufferings inspired. All the metres of classical prosody are to be found in his work. In a number of poems is found the earliest known example of rhythmic prose in which the tonic accent takes the place of quantity.

1 See F. Boulenger, *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile, de Césarée*, Text, translation and notes in *Textes et Documents*, Paris, 1908. — 2 *P. G.*, 35, 531-664, 663-720.

3 Discourses, 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 26, 33, 34, 35, 36 and 42.

4 *P. G.*, 35, 407-51. — 5 *p. G.*, 36, 457-492.

6 *P. G.*, 37, 397-522, 521-968.

7 *P. G.*, 37, 969-1452, 1451-1560. The eight poems "On the Others" are attributed to Saint Amphilochius. The epitaphs and the epigrams may be found in t. 11-82, 81-130.

8 On Saint Gregory's poetry see E. Bouvier, *Poètes et mélodies*, Nîmes, 1881.

3° Saint Gregory's Letters to the number of 244 (or perhaps 240, since letters 41, 42, 43 and 243 should probably be rejected) date for the most part from the last years of his life (383-389). These letters, whose polished style shows only too plainly that they were written for the public, are forceful and brief, says Bardenhewer. Only a few are of importance for theology: these are the letters tot, 102 (written in 382 to the priest Cledonius), and 202 (written in 387); all three are directed against Apollinarianism. Letter 243, which explains to the monk Evagrius, with the aid of similes and comparisons, how it is possible for the nature of God to exist despite the plurality of Persons, would be of great worth were its authenticity better established. The Testament, by which Saint Gregory' in 381 left all his possessions to the Church of Nazianzus, would seem to be authentic, despite certain grave criticisms which have been formulated.

ARTICLE III. SAINT GREGORY OF NYSSA. LIFE AND WORKS.

Special bibliography.

1. Edition: P. G., 44-46.

2. Studies: P. Godet, *Grégoire de Nysse (saint)* in *Diet. Théol.*, col. 1847-1852. L. Méridier, *D'influence de la seconde sophistique sur l'œuvre de Grégoire de Nysse*, Rennes, 1906. L. Taïmont, *Le discours catéchétique de saint Grégoire de Nysse* (with reference to Méridier's edition 1908), in *Lev. Aug.*, xii (1908), p. 742-748. See also G. Voisin, *Apollinaire*, Louvain, 1901 (the opposition to Apollinaris). F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, Paris, 1905. Fessler-Jungmann, *op. cit.*, I, 565-600.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

A). Life. Saint Gregory, the youngest brother of Saint Basil, was born about 335 and was brought up by his parents, or at least in his native country. Since he intended to take Orders, he was ordained lector while still very young: but he let himself be weaned from his vocation, became professor of rhetoric and married. Soon, however, the exhortations of his brother, joined to those of Saint Gregory Nazianzus, made him understand the vanity of the world. He abandoned his rostrum and about 360 went to his friends in their retreat on the Iris. There he remained for nearly

✓ G., 37, 21-338. The above mentioned studies of Guignet should be consulted for these letters.

✓ C. G., 37, 389-396. See F. Martroye (*op. cit.*) on this interesting writing. II' lives a careful commentary of it and defends its authenticity.

I' Most probably, in Bardenhewer's opinion.

ten years until in 371 Basil made him Bishop of Nyssa, a small town of Cappadocia, depending on Caesarea.

Saint Basil was not able to flatter himself that his brother showed much *administrative ability* at Nyssa. In several letters he complains¹ of his credulity and simplicity: later² he realised that he was absolutely unfitted for ecclesiastical business and declared that he was incapable of negotiating with Pope Damasus. Gregory also met with a great deal of Arian disaffection in his diocese and was deposed by a synod in 376, but returned in triumph after the death of Valens. In 370 he was present at the Council of Antioch, which met to put an end to the schism. Here Gregory came to the fore, thanks to his fine *oratorical* gifts, and was entrusted with a confidential mission to Palestine and Arabia.

Although at a loss in administrative affairs, the Bishop of Nyssa was remarkable for his eloquence and the depth of his theological and philosophical learning. This was realised at the Council of Constantinople, where he was acclaimed as a "column of orthodoxy." At the end of the Council, the 30th July 381, Theodosius published a law³ excluding from the Churches of Pontus all who were not in communion with the Bishops of Caesarea (Helladius), Melitene (Otreius) and Nyssa (Gregory). This proves, in the absence of more precise details, that he played an important part at Constantinople, where he was regarded as the intellectual successor of Basil, chosen by Providence to procure the triumph of the orthodox faith.

From the standpoint of doctrine, the work of the Council consisted in drawing up a *dogmatical canon* (can. 1) which condemned the Eunomians, Eudoxians (Homoeans), Semi-Arians (Pneumatomachi), Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, Apollinarists. To this was added a *Tomos* (doctrinal *Explanation*) on the Trinitarian question (no longer extant). It was probably in this document that the Creed of "Nicaea-Constantinople" was found. Although Gregory of Nyssa was in perfect agreement with Gregory of Nazianzus as regards doctrine, he differed from him as to the way the question of the Church of Antioch should be treated. After the death of Meletius, he preached a sermon in which

¹ *Ep.* 58, 60, 100.

² *Ep.* 215.

³ *Codex Theod.* XVI, 1, 3.

praise, and spoke bitterly of Paulinas, even calling him "adulterer" because of his "intrusion" *.

Saint Gregory seems to have been in great demand as a preacher at the Court of Constantinople. In 385 or 386 he preached the funeral oration of Princess Pulcheria, and some time after that of the Empress Flaccila. He probably took part in the new General Council at Constantinople in 382, which was attended by most of the Fathers of the second (Ecumenical Council. In 394 he was again present at a synod of Constantinople. After this date nothing more is known of him. He probably died about this time (about 395) 2.

B) Character. Saint Gregory of Nyssa has been called the Mystic and the *Philosopher*. These two terms are admirably suited to him, the first preferably from a moral aspect and the second from an intellectual point of view. Although in practical affairs he was much less capable than his brother, he was practical enough in all questions of morality, as is proved by his ascetical writings, which are even more numerous than Basil's. He is constantly preoccupied with the idea of leading his disciples to the *highest degree* of union with God by *easy stages*. Such mysticism shows him to have been a fervent disciple of Origen, and it may be said that even in his intellectual tendencies he took after the great Alexandrian.

Less practical than Basil, not such an elegant preacher as Gregory of Nazianzus, equalling them both as a theologian, Gregory of Nyssa surpassed them both as a philosopher. He was given to speculation in a greater degree than any other Greek Father of the fourth century. His chief aim was to show that far from there being opposition between faith and reason there is perfect agreement between the two. Just such a man was needed to refute the sophistical Eunomians: unfortunately he was inclined to carry his philosophy too far, and although it has been said that his philosophy does not exclude theology, it "comes before revelation; and excessive reasoning, instead of throwing light on revealed truths, only obscures them" 3. Gregory was a Neo-Plato-

* See Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 223-225.

• See various biographical details in the *Vie de sainte Macrina*, by E. Bouvy, V. *-In-*, I (1902), p. 265-288.

1 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, p. 8.

uician in philosophy, while in theology he preferred Origen. Although he avoided many of the latter's more serious errors, he had many of his defects

II. WORKS OF SAINT GREGORY OF NYSSA.

His work consists of *theological scriptural* and *ascetic* writings, together with his *Sermons* and *Letters*.

A) Theological Writings.

These are fairly numerous, although not of equal importance. They will be dealt with below according to the subjects they treat.

1. The Catechetical Discourse² contains 40 chapters in addition to the Prologue. It was intended to help Christian masters whose duty it was to instruct the catechumens. It was probably composed shortly after the Council of 381. Gregory's idea was that the explanation of Christian truths should be based on reason, on principles that were admitted by the Jews and Pagans whom it was necessary to convince. The work may be divided into three parts : the first (ch. 1-9) deals with God and the Trinity; the second (ch. 10-32) with the Incarnation and the Redemption; and the third (ch. 33-40) with the application of the Redemption by means of the Sacraments of baptism and the Holy Eucharist. As occasion arises, the author refutes the Manichaeans, the Arians and the Apollinarists. This writing, which is a veritable little "Summa theologica", the only one to exist in the East between the *Peri-Archon* and the *Explanation of the Orthodox Faith* of Saint John Damascenus, reveals Saint Gregory's ideas better than any other of his works.

2. Writings against the Arians. Many of these were composed by Gregory.

The most important is the *Contra Eunomium*³. It contains 12 books (or 13 if the xnth is divided into two). On the other hand, book II (a critical examination of the profession of faith presented to Theodosius in 383) was not a part of the original work but was added to it later. The treatise[†]

¹ See Eschatology, article v.

³ P. G., 45, 9-116. Text and French translation by L. Méridier, *Grégoire de Nysse, Discours catéchétique* (coll. *Textes et Documents*, Paris, 1908).

¹ P. G., 45, 243-1122. New edition, V. Iager, Berlin, 1921.

was composed about 381. Eunomius, whose "Apology" was energetically refuted by the Bishop of Caesarea and who had not dared to reply while Basil still lived, no sooner than he was dead, hastened to publish an Apology of the Apology. Gregory cleared his brother's name from Eunomius' calumnies, and refuted Eunomianism more forcefully than any other had done, with the exception perhaps of Basil.

The four following treatises also deal largely with the Trinitarian question :

1. *Quod non sint tres dii**, to Ablabius ;

2. *Defide* dedicated to Simplicius ;

3. *Adversus Graecos de communibus notionibus* 3*(refutation of the Pagan Polytheists by an appeal to common sense).

4. *De Trinitate, ad Eustathium* *.

Saint Gregory dealt in particular with the divinity of the Holy Ghost in a great discourse, probably preached at Constantinople in 383. He also treats the same subject in the discourse entitled inconsequently *In suam ordinationem* 6.

3. Only two writings against Apollinaris are found in his works, λ) The first is a short relation addressed to the Bishop of Alexandria, Theophilus, entitled *Adversus Apollinarem*!, written after 385; b') the other is the most important extant refutation of the Bishop of Laodicea; this is the *Antirrheticus adversus Apollinarem* in which Gregory takes to task the work entitled "Demonstration of the Incarnation in the likeness of Man", written between 376-380, and which he frequently quotes. Gregory shows : 1) that the Body of Christ did not come from heaven ; 2) that the Word did not take the place of the human understanding in Christ. He then answers Apollinaris' objections in their order and explains Catholic doctrine (54, 55, 59).

* T- G., 45, 115-136.

G., 45, 135-146 (*De Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto*).

† P. G., 45, 175-186.

‡ Not edited in P. G. See Oehler's edition, *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, Leipzig, 1858.

§ G., 46, 553-576 (*De Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti : Laus Abraham*).

¶ P. G., 46, 543-554. The discourse entitled *Contra Arium et Sabellium* (P. G., 45, 1281-1302) was certainly not composed by Saint Gregory of Nyssa; it was written about 360 and is the first document to contain the formula : *μία ο. lex, τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις*. See G. BARDY on this treatise, *Didyme*, p. 17 sq., 61 sq.

* P. G., 45, 1269-1278.

G., 45, 1123-1270. See G. VOISIN, *op. cit.*, p. 172177; 348 sq.

4. His other dogmatical writings have not the same controversial character as the foregoing :

a) Dialogue *De anima et resurrectione* (or *Macriniây* ¹, modelled on Plato's *Phaedo*. In this work Gregory puts into the mouth of his sister, Macrina, at whose deathbed he was present (probably in January 380) his own ideas on the soul and its immortality, death and resurrection and the final restoration ;

ç) the treatise *Contrafatum* ¹ (against astrological fatalism);

c) a short treatise *De infantibus qui fracmature abripiuntur* ³ (an attempt to show the workings of Providence on the subject of children who die at an early age).

B) Scriptural Works.

A distinction will be made between those written with a properly *exegetical* purpose and those written with a *moral end* in view.

1. Among the first class should be mentioned :

à) The *Liber de hominis opificio* ⁴ (379), which completes Saint Basil's work in which the sixth day was not treated. Gregory shows, according to the Scriptures and human reason, what was, is, and will be man's estate, before and after the Fall and in the life to come. The wisdom of God in His forming of the human body is admirably described.

b) The *Liber in Hexaemeron* ⁵ (written about 380) treats at length of the creation, and is, in a sense, a revision of Basil's work dealing with various subtle and difficult questions which Basil had purposely omitted to explain to the people. The author defends both the writing of Moses and that of Basil ; hence the title often given to the treatise : *Apologetic-al Explanation on the Hexaemeron*;

c) The short treatise *On the Witch of Endor* ⁶, which affirms against Origen that it was not Samuel but a devil that appeared to Saül.

2. In the second class of Gregory's Scriptural works are the following :

De vita Moysis ⁷, treats of the mysterious ways by which the soul is brought to perfection. It was written by Gregory towards the end of his life for Caesarius, a young man who had asked his advice. The *Life of Moses* is only the framework in which is woven the spiritual teaching of the work.

¹ Τα Μακρινία. P. G., 46, ii-i60.

^{*} P. G., 45, 145-174. — ³ P. G., 46, 161-191.

⁴ P. G., 44, 123-256. — ⁵ P. G., 44, 61-124.

⁶ P. G., 45, 107-114. Saint Methodius of Olympus and Saint Eustathius of Antioch had already given the same explanation.

⁷ P. G., 44, 297-430.

b) The treatises *In Psalmorum inscriptiones* *also treat of the spiritual progress of the soul, and distinguish five stages in this progress which correspond to the five books of the Psalter. The author then gives a moral explanation of the titles of the Psalms.

c) All Saint Gregory's sermons - have the same purpose : not only the sermons *Pro octava* on Psalm vi, which forms a kind of appendix to the foregoing treatises, but also the eight sermons on *Ecclesiastes*, the fifteen sermons on the *Canticle of Canticles*, the eight on the *Beatitudes* and five on the *Lord's Prayer*. A spiritual teaching rather than exegesis in the proper sense of the word is found in these works, especially those which deal with the Old Testament. Such a method, of which the author sometimes asserts the necessity, is not without its dangers, for it is easy for spiritual accommodations to become real exegetical works, and this is a procedure which is not admissible.

C). Saint Gregory's ascetic works have much in common with the foregoing.

1. The treatise *De virginitate* ' is the best known. The author is dealing with *perfection* in general and shows that by becoming perfect the soul is made the spouse of Christ, a theme he had already developed with regard to the *Canticle*. Nevertheless the virtue of virginity occupies a considerable place in this book, for it is a powerful factor for the purification of the soul, and Saint Gregory insists on the practical means of increasing and preserving it.

2. The four following treatises⁴ treat of particular subjects : a) what is required of the Christian (*De professione Christiana*); b) nature of perfection (*De perfectione*); c) the degree of piety necessary for the monk, and the means of advancing therein (*De instituto Christiano*); d) necessity of mortification (*De castigatione*).

3. The *Life of Saint Maorina* 5, written about 380, is an excellent commentary, by means of examples, of the ascetical and spiritual teaching explained theoretically in the above mentioned works.

D). Sermons and Letters.

I. Sermons or Discourses⁴. Saint Gregory's oratorical work comprises, in addition to the already mentioned *homilies* and a number of other special sermons :

a) Dogmatic sermons (see above, writings against the Arians).

b) Three moral sermons (one against the custom of postponing baptism).

c) Several sermons for feast days (Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost).

' P. G., 44, 431-608. — P. G., 44, 607-1302.

1 P. G., 46, 317-416. — 4 P. G., 46, 237-316.

' P. G., 46, 959-1000. The sister of Basil and Gregory, whom Gregory « listed on her deathbed. Dialogue *De anima et resurrectione*. See E. BOUVY, *ainte Macrine*, see p. 425. — 6 P. G., 46, 433-958.

d) Panegyrics of the Saints (SS. Stephen, Theodore, Ephraem, the Forty Martyrs, Gregory Thaumaturgus).

e) Funeral Orations (Meletius of Antioch, Pulcheria, Flaccila, Basil).

The *eloquence* of Gregory of Nyssa is somewhat too studied, at least in his funeral orations. He possesses neither the noble simplicity of Basil nor the vividness of Gregory of Nazianzus. He was, however, in great demand in Byzantium, and Photius declares : " No other rhetor has so brilliant a style nor so sweet to the ear ",

2. Letters These number 26, and as a whole are of little importance. The second blames the abuse of pilgrimages, in terms which Benedict XIV, many years later, found excessive, although their severity may be explained by Gregory's desire to prevent abuses which were only too real. On the other hand, letter 3 mentions the advantages of pilgrimages and tells of the pilgrimage which Gregory himself made in Palestine about 380. The letter to Letoius (about 390) deals with the penitential discipline for apostates and other great sinners : it is classed among the *Canonical Epistles*.

ARTICLE IV.

SAINT AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM¹

Saint Amphilochius, born about 340 and apparently second cousin to Gregory of Nazianzus, was for some time a lawyer at Constantinople. About 370 he returned to Cappadocia and began to lead an ascetic life. Saint Basil made him Bishop of Iconium in 373, and very interesting letters, many of which are extant, passed between them. He turned his talents to the suppression of *Arianism*. The synodal letter is still extant which he sent in 376 in the name of the Bishop of his own province, united in Council, to the bishops of a neighbouring province persuading them to admit unhesitatingly the full divinity of the Holy Ghost. It is also known that he assisted at the (Ecumenical Council of 381).

¹ *P. G.*, 46, 998-1108. Canonical Epistle, *P. G.*, 45, 221-236.

^a *P. G.*, 39, 35-130. To this edition should be added K. Holl's *Amphilochius von Iconium*... Tübingen, 1904 (containing a new homily, p. 91 mJ and G. Ficker's *Amphilochiantiy* 1, Leipzig, 1906 (containing a homily aff fragments).

and composed a treatise on the Holy Ghost, which is now lost. But he turned his attention especially to the *Encratites*. At the beginning of his episcopate he attacked them in a work which is still extant for the most part, and in 390 presided a Council convoked against them[†] at Side in Pamphilia. It would seem that Amphilochius was a man of action, a pastor of souls, rather than a theologian and philosopher.² It is as such that he is revealed in the letters of the Cappadocians and in his extant discourses (6 sermons and the recently edited homilies). Nothing is known of his life after the Council of 394 at Constantinople at which he assisted. He probably died before 403.

ARTICLE V.

TEACHING OF THE CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS.

Special bibliography.

i. On the Trinitarian Question: J. Schwane, *op. cit.*, n, p. 232-388. Th. de Régnon, *Etudes sur la Sainte Trinité*, chiefly t. III-IV (*passim*). J. Tixeront, *La doctrine trinitaire des Cappadociens*, in *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, p. 76-89. A. KRANICH, *Der hl. Basilius in seiner Stellung zum Filioque*, Braunsberg, 1881. See also G. Bardy, *Didyme l'Aveugle*, chap. H1 (*passim*).

ii. On Christology and Soteriology, see J. Tixeront, *La Christologie grecque au IV^e siècle*, in *Hist. Degni.*, ii, p. 112-130. Michel, *Hypostase and (Union) Hypostatique*, in *Diet, théol.*, col 381 sq., 458 sq. l Rivièr e, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, ch. ix and xi. C. van Crombrugge, *De soteriologie Christiana prim.pont.*, Louvain, 1905.

3. On Grace and Anthropology in general, see J. Schwane, *op. cit.*, in, 11-20, 41-61, 77-91. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, ch. vi (*passim*). J. Van der Meersch, *Grâce*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 1566 sq. J. Rivièr e, *Justification, La doctrine avant le pélagianisme* in *Diet, théol.*, col. '081, sq. É. SCHOLL, *Die Lehre des hl. Basilius von der Gnade*, I iiburg im B., 1881. K. Hummer, *Des hl. Gregor, von Nas. des III. Lehre von der Gnade*, Kempten, 1890. A. Krampf, *Der Urszustand d. Menschen nach der Lehre des hl. Gregor, von Nyssa*, Wurtzburg, 1899.

[†] The *Euchites* were also condemned at Side. See above, p. 303 note.

The theological fragments of Amphilochius (*I. G.*, 39, 97-118) are not all In-
 knthentic. K. Ho11, *op. cit.*, exaggerates when he concludes from these that
 In- made valuable contributions in theology to the Trinitarian and Christological
 ■in. lions; he was a second-rate theologian. See L. Saltet, *Bull. lit.*
I. .I., vu (1905), p. 121-127. See also F. Cavallera, *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, vni
 I P. 473-497- The *Letter to Seleucus*, edited among the poetical works
 ni S. Gregory Nazianzus (*A G.*, 37, 1577-1600) should probably be attributed
 tn Amphilochius.

4. On Ecclesiology, see P. Batiffol, *Le Siècle apostolique*, chap. iii. See the same author, *L'Ecclesiologie de saint Basile* in *Echos d'Orient*, XXI (1922), p. 9-30. V. Grumel, *Saint Basile et le Siècle apostolique*, *ibid.*, p. 280-292.

I. SOURCES OF THE TEACHING OF THE CAPPADOCIAN FATHERS.

The only real sources of their teaching are the Scriptures and Tradition. The influence of philosophy on the ideas of the Greek Fathers is far less than at first appears. The terms *οὐσία*, *ὑπόστασις*, *φύσις* were of course properly philosophical, but they were also used currently by the cultivated classes. Some Fathers, in fact, mistrusted philosophy and laid to its charge the ravages caused by Arianism and Manichaeism. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus went as far as to say that its introduction into the Church could be likened to one of the plagues of Egypt'. Saint Basil was milder and even recommended that certain philosophers should be read: nevertheless little philosophy is found in his works except in his treatise against Eunomius. Saint Gregory of Nyssa was not so discreet and it has been said that he made too large a use of philosophy. Even for him, however, it was no more than an instrument. The true sources of his teaching were the Scriptures and Tradition.

A) The Scriptures.

In the study of the Scriptures the Cappadocians occupy a middle place between Alexandrian allegorism and literal method favoured by the School of Antioch: "By their insistence on the unshakable character of the *canon of Holy Writ*; by their endeavours to fix the meaning of *expressions* according to their ordinary meaning in the Bible; by their consideration of *controverted passages* as belonging to a whole apart from which they could not be properly understood, they outlined the chief elements of the historical method, Although they remained attached on one hand to the use of *allegorical interpretation*, they nevertheless made great advances in literal exegesis" 3. Certain distinctions, however] should be made between the various Cappadocians. *Saint Gregory of Nyssa*, a fervent disciple of Origen, practised

1 *Oratio* XXXII, 25. — 3 *Sermon* XXII (*De legendis libris gentilium*).

3 G. BARDY, *Didymie VAveugle*, p. 204-205.

allegorism to a large extent. Saint Basil, practically minded, active and authoritative, who strove so energetically to put an end to the Schism of Antioch and bring back the Arians to the Nicene faith, made a greater resistance to the influence deriving from Origen, although he had collaborated with Gregory Nazianzen in the *Philocalia**. The latter, on the contrary, was more impressed by the method of his first master, and in this resembled more closely his namesake of Nyssa.

B) Tradition.

Although the Scriptures are the chief doctrinal source of these authors, it was not the only one: *tradition* was the other, more accessible to the ordinary Christian. The Fathers of the fourth century were led to study it by the necessity of *explaining the development* which had taken place in their time in ecclesiastical theology. "More light was shed on many dogmas — that of the divinity of the Holy Ghost for instance — *formulas* were adopted — as the *ὁμοούσιο*, — *liturgical uses* and ritual not mentioned in Scripture or only referred to in an incomplete and obscure fashion, begin to prevail and multiply. All this had to be justified against adversaries, and this need led our authors to insist, in a greater measure than heretofore, on a certain teaching, *an oral tradition distinct from the Scriptures*, handed down from the time of the Apostles. This is the *παράδοσις ἀγραφοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων, τῶν πατέρων*, used by the Apostles and their successors to transmit to us the things they did not include in the Scriptures. It is mentioned not only by the Cappadocians but also by Saint John Chrysostom and Epiphanius. This oral tradition contains no less guarantee of truth than Scripture. It is rejected by the heretics; and in this they are wrong"³.

The necessity of refuting Eunomius in particular led the Cappadocians to insist on this point. Saint Basil's ideas on the subject, however, are best developed in his treatise *On the Holy Ghost* 5. It is true that in order to establish the authority of tradition he bases his argument on customs which affect discipline more than dogma, and that he explains the special form of the transmission of revealed truths by a discipline of the secret which goes back to the Apostles. Whatever may be the value of these arguments they prove at least that Basil recognised a source of faith as distinct from the Scriptures. *Saint Gregory of Nyssa* also proves the faith of Nicaea to the heretics from the Scriptures and

* He firmly rejected pure allegorism. *In Hexaemeron*, IX, I. *Traditio non scripta apostolorum, patrum.*

¹ J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, 1415.

² J. SCHWANE, *Op. cit.*, III, 426-428.

De spiritu Sancto, 16, 22, 25, 27, 66, 67, 71, 77.

by a kind of prescription τ, similar to Tertulian's, which he confuses with tradition. *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus* also supposes the existence of revealed truths not contained in Scripture, but he insists chiefly on the *illumination* which the revealed deposit of faith has received from the Holy Ghost since the time of the Apostles ①.

Although the Fathers of the fourth century had not as yet clearly identified this oral tradition with the *ordinary magisterium of the Church*, they recognised that the Church had the power of deciding controversies, condemning error and defending the faith. Her *infallibility* in using this right is implicitly affirmed and the entire history of the controversies and Councils of the fourth century would be inexplicable were it supposed that these principles were not admitted by the majority of bishops. Nevertheless, with the exception of the *recognised symbols*, the organs by which the faith of the Church was expressed had not yet been determined with any degree of precision. The distinction of general and particular *Councils* had not been perfectly established, nor yet the conditions necessary to give them a universal value. Similarly, it was not until the following century that "the argument drawn from the *Fathers* acquired all its force and received definite approbation" ③.

II. THE TRINITY.

The Cappadocians, who on the subject of the Trinity seem to have received the mission of bringing back to orthodoxy the hesitant and right-minded among the Arians, also fixed Oriental terminology on three main points : *a*) they distinguished the ουσία from the ὑπόστασι ; *b*~) they rendered more precise the meaning of δροούσιο ; *c*) they defended the divinity of the Holy Ghost

A). The ουσία and the ὑπόστασι .

Saint Basil 4 defined the ουσία or substance : " That which is *common* in individuals of the same species (τὸ κοινόν) possessed in the same measure by all, so that the whole class is given one name, not having particular reference to the

1 *Contra Eutychianum*, IV.

• *Orat.* XXXI, 12, 27.

3 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 17.

4 *Epist.* 38 to his brother, St. Gregory.

individual". In order that this ουσία should have real existence it is necessary that it should be determined and limited by special characteristics : the being thus determined is the *person* or hypostasis (ὕπόστασις) a concrete differentiated being. As may be seen, such a definition does not make sufficient distinction between the person and the individual. Saint Basil nevertheless prepared the way for this clearer distinction by stating that the hypostasis is a being χαρ' ἐχαστον, that is to say, a separate being, although he did not insist enough on the special mode of being proper to the person. By means of these distinctions Basil was able to explain his use of the Origenist formula of *three hypostases*, which he regarded as the indispensable complement of the Nicene definition. The bishops of Nazianzus and of Nyssa were of the same opinion.

As for the term πρόσωπον, a literal translation of the Latin *persona*, it was accepted only with reserves by Basil on account of its origin : having come from the theatre and meaning the *playing of a part*, it might seem to lend itself to Sabellianism which taught that the distinction of persons in God was no more than the expression of the various parts played by one and the same Divine Person. The term ὑπόστασις seemed to offer a greater guarantee of orthodoxy.

B). The δμοούσιο.

The Cappadocians, having adopted the formula of the three hypostases, so dear to the Homoiousians, had less difficulty in persuading the latter to accept the δμοούσιο, for which they had shown such repugnance. It has been said that these Doctors employed the word δμοούσιο, but understood it in a Homoiousian sense, and a fictitious distinction has been made between the Nicaeans of the beginning of the century and the Neo-Nicaeans at the end. The latter, it was averred, were but Semi-Arians, "speaking the language of Nicaea". This accusation is due to a confusion between *differences of view-point* and *doctrinal differences*.

¹ The Cappadocians when speaking of God give the same meaning to φῶς and οὐσία.

Basil, *Epist.* 236. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus is less categorical than Saint Hilary and employs this expression with the necessary safeguards. (*hat.* 29 (/Zhp/ in), 2. It is also used by Saint Gregory of Nyssa. Nevertheless, the μὴ δὲ δόξα did not become current in the East until the fifth century.

It is of the very nature of the Trinity that not only are we unable to *understand* the plurality of the Persons in the unity of nature but find it difficult to explain the mystery itself. If, as was usual in the East and in Egypt, the unity of the nature is first proposed, there is the danger of compromising the real distinction of the Persons, and falling into the Modalist error. On the other hand, if the distinction of the Persons is first proposed, there is danger of *Tritheism*, but this may be avoided if the divine unity is carefully maintained. Both these points of view are orthodox and legitimate, provided that neither excludes the other x.

The Semi-Arians adopted the second point of view, first proposing clearly the real distinction of the Persons; but they failed to maintain with sufficient energy the numerical unity of the substance in God : hence their preference for the formula *ὁμοιούσιο*, which logically leads to Tritheism; *ὁμοιο* indicates an accidental resemblance and implies a substantial difference. The Cappadocians perceived this danger and avoided it.

Saint Basil declares in a letter : “ As for us, according to the word of truth, we do not say either that the Son is similar or dissimilar to the Father, for both terms are equally repugnant. Similar and dissimilar imply only (accidental) qualities but God has none of these. But, confessing the unity of nature, we admit the *ὁμοούσιο* and we *avoid adding*’ to the Father, Who is God in substance, the engendered Son, Who is also God in substance, for *in that lies the meaning of the* *ὁμοούσιο* ” . Basil admits, however, the *ὁμοιο κατ’οὐσίαν*, provided that to this is added *ἀπαρἀλλάκτω*, meaning *with no difference* ‡. Similarly, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus takes *ὁμοούσιο* as signifying an absolutely substantial identity; he considers the Persons as *distinct, but not the divinity* which remains indivisible⁴. He seems to have compressed his whole teaching into this concise formula : *ἐν τὰ τρία ττ, βεότῃτι, καὶ τὸ ἵν τρία ταῖ ἰδιότησιν : unum (sunt) tres divinitate et (hoc) unum (est) tres proprietatibus (personalibus)*⁵.

Saint Gregory of Nyssa for his part teaches that the *οὐσία* is not shared by the Persons in such a way that there are three *οὐσίαι*, as there are three *πρόσωπα*. It is true⁶ that he claims that just as we say, when speaking of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that they are one God and not three Gods, so, in speaking of Peter, James and John, we should

^x Father Th. de Régnon explains at length the advantages of each of the » methods in his *Etudes... sur la Sainte Trinité*, t. I, *Etudes* V and VI, p. 302-331, 335-407.

³ *Epist.*, vin, 3. — *3 Epist.*, IX, 3.

⁴ Ἀμεριστο ἐν μεμερισμένοι ἡ Θεότη . *Orat.* 31 (*theol.* v), 14. — *5 Ibid.*, |

⁶ At the beginning of the *Quod non sint tres dii* (*P. G.*, 45, 120-129), S. Tu. dk Régnon, *op. cit.*, I, p. 376-380.

also say that they are one man and not three men. But it cannot be concluded from this that he considered the Three Persons as being distinct, as three men are distinct from one another. Gregory makes no mistake about God, as is evident, but about man : misled by an exaggerated idealism derived from Plato, he did not perceive that among men, unlike God, only the abstract essence is common, not the *concrete* essence existing of itself which is the person.

Conclusion : The ideas of the Cappadocian Fathers regarding the $\delta\mu\omega\omega\upsilon\sigma\omega$ are perfectly orthodox; but they endeavoured, in a greater measure than Saint Athanasius, to understand the *point of view* of the Semi-Arians, and were thus able to bring back the latter to the orthodoxy of Nicaea.

C) The Holy Ghost.

The divinity of the Holy Ghost was especially attacked at the end of the fourth century. The Cappadocians were the most vigorous adversaries of the Pneumatomachi, and each one of them has combated them in a treatise or discourse.

Saint Basil proves the divinity of the Holy Ghost in his work *De Spiritu Sancto*, although he purposely refrains from giving Him the name of God. Elsewhere he is not so cautious, and declares formally that the Holy Ghost is God, consubstantial with the Father and the Son. *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus* develops the same teaching in his xxxist discourse, which may be summed up in the following dialogue : " What? The Holy Ghost is God? — Certainly. — What? Consubstantial? — Yes, since He is God " 3. And the orator (alls in the aid of the Christian experience of his hearers in labour of his thesis. He endeavours to explain by the progress of revelation the relative silence of the Scriptures with regard to the Holy Ghost, a silence from which wrong conclusions were drawn by the Arians. The Old Testament revealed the Father, while the New reveals the Son : therein the Holy Ghost is but imperfectly manifested, but He is now fully revealed by making souls like to God in baptism, which He could not do were He not God.

¹ Saint Augustine refuted this opinion, unaware perhaps that it was Gregory's, in the *De Trinitate*, bk. VII, VI (n. II); *P. L.*, 42, 944.

With regard to the difficulties inherent to the Greek conception and the « ly in which the Doctors maintained the divine unity, see Tu. DIT RÉGNON, 17 *id.*, I, p. 366-408. For the Anomœan misuse of the expression $\alpha\gamma\iota\nu\nu\eta\tau\omicron$ n. signifying the divine essence, and their refutation by the Cappadocians, see III ¹ II. DE RÉGNON, *ibid.*, II, p. 185-259.

I ² *Oral.*, 31 (*theol.* v), 10.

Saint Gregory of Nyssa, who agrees with the other two Cappadocians on all these points, surpasses them by his precision on the special question of the procession of the Holy Ghost, which they had hardly touched. His formula is that of the Orient: the spirit proceeds from the Father by the Son. Nevertheless the *Son is not an inert instrument*: He partakes in the production of the Holy Ghost. This He does in virtue of a causality he receives from the Father, which, however, does in no wise lessen the Father's own causality nor prevent Him from being the first principle of the Holy Ghost. Here the doctrine of the *Filioque* is both supposed and insinuated, although the role of the Father is chiefly insisted upon. This is the point of view ordinarily held by the Greek Church. *Saint Epiphanius*, however, is closer to the Latin theologians, and although he does not say that the Holy Ghost *proceeds* from the Father *and* from the Son, he employs expressions meaning the same thing, for instance, that the Holy Ghost *comes* from the Father *and* from the Son³. But Saint Epiphanius was an exception in the East and perhaps derived his formula from the West⁴.

HI. CHRIST.

A). In their Christology the Cappadocians forcefully maintained against Apollinaris, the integrity of the Saviour's human nature, and at the same time avoided the hypostatic dualism of Theodore of Mopsuestia. In Christ, says Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, there are two natures, but not two sons, and he also gives to Mary the title of θεοτόχο, Mother of God. Similarly, Saint Gregory of Nyssa affirms that Christ is not ἄλλο and ετερο, but εν πρόσωπο⁵; he even develops the theory of the *communication of idioms* already initiated by Origen. In spite of this strong faith, firmly based on tradition, it is possible to find in their writings expressions which seem to favour both Monophysitism and Nestorianism, but such expressions should be explained in

¹ Chiefly at the end of the *Quod non sint tres dii*.

³ On the Patristic theology of the Holy Ghost, especially in the East, see Th. de Régnon, *op. cit.*, all vol. iv.

⁴ The Holy Ghost is: “ἐκ τῆ αὐτῆς οὐσίας Πατρός καὶ Υἱοῦ”; He is ὁ ἐκ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ”. *Auróralas*, 7, 9.

⁵ Didymus has the same expression in the *De Spiritu Sancto*, but it is possible that the translation is faulty. — ⁵ *Epist.* X. — ⁶ *Contra Eunom.*, V.

keeping with their teaching as a whole. Christological terminology did not become really precise before the great controversies of the fifth century¹.

B). Soteriological teaching. This, with slight shades of difference, may be connected with the three theories already mentioned². Saint Basil and Saint Gregory of Nazianzus prefer the *realist theory* of satisfaction. The former insists on the necessity of an expiation capable of appeasing Divine justice, and man's absolute powerlessness to give such satisfactions. This could only be given by Christ, Who gave it by becoming a sinner and a victim for the sake of mankind. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus expresses this doctrine in a vigorous and concise expression: "Christ", he says, "became for us" *αὐτοαμαρτία καὶ αὐτοκατάρτα* (deliberate sin and deliberate malediction)⁴.

Saint Gregory of Nyssa chiefly followed the theory of union, already outlined by Saint Athanasius. He would even seem to say that *Christ's humanity embraces the whole of human nature*⁵, but this must be put down to an exaggerated use of Platonian terminology. Saint Gregory, like the other Fathers who taught the same doctrine, did not deny the individual character of Christ's human nature, but describes vigorously the universal efficacy of His work of Redemption. He was not unacquainted with the theory of satisfaction and occasionally refers to it⁶.

It was also Gregory who gave, in the fourth century, the clearest exposition of the theory of the rights of the devil, previously proposed by Origen. In his Catechetical Discourse he affirms that God, Who is eminently just, could not wrest us by force from the devil, whose possession we had become. The devil had the right to a ransom, which he estimated above our real value. He obtained it, and the ransom was Christ. But the devil was taken in his own trap when, like a voracious lish careless of the hook he rushed forward to seize the Man-God, was caught and constrained to relinquish his prey⁷. Saint Basil⁸ also, it would seem, approved this "mutually agreed redemption" of which his brother speaks; but Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, although of the same school, condemned it absolutely. He considered it an insult

¹See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 120-130. A. Michel, (*Union*) *l'Épistatistique*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 458-460.

See p. 352. — ³In *Psalm*. XLVIII, v, 3.

⁴*Orat.* 37, I. — ⁵*Orat. catech.*, 16, 25, 32.

⁶See J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, p. 155-159.

⁷*Orat. catech.*, 22-24, 26. The deceiver was thus deceived as was fitting to Divine Wisdom, crowning that work of justice. See J. Rivière, *ibid.*, p. 184-388. — ⁸In *Psalm*, vii, 2, and XLVIII, 3.

to God to say that the devil not only received a ransom from God, but a God in ransom. And in this, later theology confirmed his view

IV. THE CHURCH.

It would be unreasonable to expect to find in the fourth century a complete theological teaching on the Church, a systematic explanation of the rights and constitution of the Church. This aspect of theology, but little developed in the West, was still less so in the East, where the Fathers were chiefly preoccupied with the discussions on the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The *independence of the Church* from the State, so forcefully affirmed by Basil against Valens, was, however, recognised by all, in spite of the obsequiousness of a great number of Oriental bishops. It was generally realised also that the *unity of the Church* was necessary, and the authority of the *Apostolic See*, which is the essential condition of this unity, is more or less clearly indicated.

Saint Basil recognised that Peter had been set above the other disciples, προκριθεί 3; and this word must be taken in the meaning of a true chief, as may be seen by comparing it with Didymus' *De Trinitate*, in which, having called Peter the head of the Apostles (ὁ ἐν ἀποστόλοις κορυφαῖος 4), he then terms him ὁ πρόκριτος τῶν ἀποστόλων 5. In the fourth century it was nowhere doubted that the successors of Peter went at Rome⁶. Saint Basil's friend, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, speaking of Rome as a Christian, calls her the *president of all* (τὴν πρόεδρον τῶν ὅλων) after having previously admitted that in point of fact she exercised a special and salutary influence in the West; moreover, in the present as in the past she goes straight to her goal (καὶ νῦν ἐπ' ἐστὶν εὐδρομο 7).

¹ *Orat.*, 45, c. 22.

² Gr e f.; Naz., *Orat.* XLiii, 48-51. See above, the life of S. Basil, p. 406. I

³ *De iudicio Dei*, 7 (A. G. 31, 672).

⁴ *De Trinitate*, 1, 27. He also says : Πέτρος, ὁ τὰ πρωτεία ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἔχων, *Ibid.*, 11, 10. — s n, jg.

⁵ See the Introduction to Book II, p. 306 sq.

⁷ *Carmen de vita sua* (v. 568-572. A. G., 37, 1068). In the previous v. n J Gregor] had opposed the Old and the New Rome from a political standpoint. Here he speaks from a religious point of view. Here is a Latin translation of the text : " Quod spectat ad illorum fidem, vetus quidem jamdudum atque nunc rucurrit, Occidentem totum devinciens salutari doctrina, quemadmodum par est, tibi (jute universis jncsidet, totum colat Dei concordiam". Further on (v. 1001-1017 1700), he wittily refutes those who, by drawing a comparison with the Ntlfl would establish the superiority of the East. See above, p. 419, note 3. I

The manner in which this presidency was understood may be seen from the facts. The following are a number in which the Cappadocians were implicated :

1. The Council of 381 attributed to the Bishop of Rome a universal primacy in its third canon, which raised the See of Constantinople to a presidency of honour (τὰ πρεσβεία τῇ τιμῇ) "after the Bishop of Rome" (μετὰ τὸν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπον). The concession of the primacy of honour hid, in the minds of many of the bishops, the evident desire (as was later seen) that this honour should be accompanied by effective rights like those of the Pope (which, however, did not derive from any council).

2. In 377 Pope Damasus made a doctrinal condemnation of Apollinaris, the suffragan Bishop of Antioch, and Timothy, the Apollinarian Bishop of Beryta. This condemnation was received without murmur by the Bishops of Egypt (Council of Alexandria, 378), and of Syria (Council of Antioch, 379)¹, and lastly by the whole of the East at Constantinople in 381. The Pope had been asked to intervene by Saint Basil, 377².

3. The Bishop of Caesarea admitted that the Pope had the right to re-establish bishops who had been deposed (such was the case of Eustathius of Sebaste, re-established in his See by the Council of Tyana at the request of Liberius, 367³) or to confirm the election of the new bishops; the whole question of the Church of Antioch may be reduced to that.

4. In the grave affair of the schism of Antioch, Basil first took sides against Paulinus, for he was under the impression that Meletius would be recognised by Rome⁴, and when the contrary could no longer be doubted he believed that the Pope had misinterpreted the facts of the case. Hence is explained a certain feeling against Damasus that is perceived in his private correspondence⁵. He never, however, doubted the Pope's authority. Saint Basil even speaks of the "eminent dignity⁶" of the Bishop of Rome, and his recriminations would be incomprehensible had he not regarded Damasus as having very real obligations to the Eastern Churches, even apart from all questions of faith. The action taken against Apollinaris, which is mentioned above, is of greater importance as regards fourth century Ecclesiology.

¹ This Council, which in its first canon determined the territorial limits of the Patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch, never attempted to impose such limits on the Bishop of Rome, in spite of the impression caused by the recent intervention of the latter in a suffragan diocese of Antioch and the subsequent animosity shown by many of its members. This is clear proof that the rights of Rome were not to be called in question, and that they were at least implicitly recognised by the Council.

² *Epist.* 263 (of 377). — ³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Due to the letters brought by Sylvanus of Tarsus to the Council of Tyana. *Epist.* 67.

⁵ *Epist.* 214, 215, 239, which obviously cannot be classed with his doctrinal writings. — ⁶ *Epist.*, 239.

⁷ Saint Basil's opinion on this question is discussed with fairly wide divergence, by F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*; P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 85-115, and the *Éclé debate de saint Basile*, in the *Echos d'Orient*, 1922, p. 930; V. Grumel, *Basile et le Siège apostolique, ibid.*, 1922, p. 280-292.

V. GRACE AND THE SACRAMENTS.

A). Grace.

The teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers on grace is chiefly concerned with the *actual state* of man. But like Saint Athanasius, who also insisted more particularly on this point¹, they recalled when necessary that man originally enjoyed a state of blessedness, which was characterised on the one hand by exemption from suffering, and by immortality, and on the other by a close union with God² resulting from charity and the pure image of God possessed in wisdom and perfect liberty³.

Since the time of Petau it has been usual to repeat that the Greek Fathers hardly accord any mention to original sin. This assertion, however, must not be exaggerated. Several among them speak of the first fall and give to it the name of sin. According to Saint Athanasius⁴, all men have inherited the sin of Adam, and Didymus calls the first sin παλαιά αμαρτία⁵. Saint Basil names it the prototype of sin, transmitted to us by Adam : την ἀμαρτίαν παρεπεμψεν⁶. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus similarly speaks of our *first sin*. Nevertheless, the greater number of texts found in the works of the Greek Fathers contain no more than equivalent expressions : original sin, on account of its special nature, is usually designated by the words *stain* (ρῦπο), *corruption* (φθορά), *curse* (κατάρα), *condemnation* (κατάκρισι), *family debt* (χρέο χειρόγραφον πατρων), etc⁷. Saint Gregory of Nyssa, in his treatise *De infantibus qui premature abripiuntur*, seems to have troubled very little about this original blemish⁸.

Fallen man still remains *free*. The Greek Fathers also insisted on this point, either in order to refute the Manichaeans, or to make clear the part which man plays in his own sanctification. Nor did they omit to mention the effects of

¹ In *Contra Gentes* and *De Incarnatione*.

* Basil, *Hom.*, ix, n. 6, 7. Greg. Naz., *Orat.*, xlv, 8.

³ Greg. Nyss., *De hominis opificio*, §6, 17. In this writing the author emits in the form of hypothesis, certain quaint ideas on the original state of man.

⁴ *Contra Arianos*, I, 51. — ⁵ *De Trinitate*, II, 12; *P. G.*, 39, 684.

⁶ Basil, *Hom.* vm. — ⁷ Greg. Naz., *Orat.* xix, 13.

⁸ See M. Jugie, *Immaculée Conception*, in *Did. théol.*, col. 894-897.

⁹ Saint Augustine (*Contra Jul.*, bk. 1; *P. L.*, 44, 641 sq.) among the Orient writers draws chiefly on Saint Greg. Naz., n. 15, Saint Basil, n. 16-18, and Saint John Chrysostom, n. 21-29, notably the latter's homily *Ad neophytos* (not extant), which contains the expression : χειρόγραφον πατρων, n. 26.

grace, not only *sanctifying grace* in the proper sense of the word, which they chiefly regarded as a "deification" of man by the Holy Ghost¹ in baptism, by the application of the merits of Christ, but also actual grace. With regard to the latter, only the very clear notions of *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus* will be mentioned here. He expressly attributed to grace the beginning and the end of all good²* All the good we possess comes from *God's*, and especially spiritual benefits. Regarding this latter point, he declares in a most important text⁴,

1. that the call to holiness comes from God and not from natural aptitude ;
2. that without grace it is impossible to will rightly ;
3. that even our choice of good is willed by God ;
4. that our salvation depends on God and on ourselves ;
5. that since even *our willing* is from God, *all is from God*⁵. This, however, does not exclude our co-operation, as the author insists at the end of his discourse⁶*

B). Sacraments.

In this connection the following more interesting points may be noticed :

1. The Cappadocians still admitted the practice of re-baptising which had been forbidden in the third century by Firmilian of Caesarea. They admitted the validity of baptism among schismatics, but not that of heretics who rejected the traditional faith⁷. In this respect they represented a local tradition, which has since given way to a general and Apostolic tradition.

The Cappadocians' teaching on the Blessed Sacrament is, for the most part, simply traditional. Nevertheless, in Saint Gregory of Nyssa may be found an attempt at a scientific explanation, which is worth mentioning⁸. He

¹ Saint Gregory says that if the Holy Ghost is not adorable, πῶ ἐμέ θεοὶ διὰ βαπτίσματος . *Orat.* xxxi, 18.

Παρ' οὐ καλὸν ἅπαν καὶ ἀρχεται καὶ εἰ τέλος ἐρχεται. *Orat.* vi, 12.

See the excellent list in *Orat.* XIV, 23. — 4 *Orat.* XXXVII, 13.

Quoniam *velle* quoque ipsum a Deo est, optimo jure *taluni* Deo assignavit.
I. ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὸ βούλεσθαι παρὰ θεοῦ, τὸ παν εἰκότῳ ἀνέβηκε τῷ θεῷ.

/hid., 15 and 21-22.

Basil, *Eplst.* 188, can. t ; 147, can. 2. Greg. Naz., *Oral.* XL, 26.

" *Orat. catech.* 37.

says that the bread eaten by Christ during His mortal life was gradually transformed into His Body; similarly the bread which is sanctified by the word of God is instantly (ευθύ) converted into the Body of the Word of God, and we ourselves are divinised by our union with this Body. There is no question here of *impanation*, since Gregory regards the Eucharistic Body of Christ as the same as His historical Body. This explanation, though imperfect, is far from being contrary to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, to which it leads, for the change envisaged by Saint Gregory is a conversion of the nature (φύσις), of the essential element (στοιχεία) of the offerings.

3. The Cappadocians considered the Sacrament of Penance as possessing a real efficacy. Saint Gregory brought up this point against the Novatians² he compared penance to a baptism, a baptism of tears³. Saint Basil and his brother give greater precision to the conditions on which pardon is vouchsafed by the Church in the name of God. In their Canonical Epistles⁴, the Cappadocians carefully classify the faults and their punishment. It should be remarked that for certain sins, apostasy for instance, the satisfaction lasted until death⁵.

4. Saint Basil's teaching on marriage raises a number of difficulties. In his *Moralia*⁶ he clearly states "that it is not lawful for a husband who has repudiated his wife (even in the case of adultery) to marry again, nor for the repudiated wife to take another husband". Marriage is therefore indissoluble, even in the case of adultery. Nevertheless the punishments given in the *Canonical Epistles* do not correspond with these principles, and the husband is not *punished* as an adulterer if he should marry again. This divergence must probably be regarded as a *practical* concession, only as regard-» *penitential discipline*, made to the current usage founded in civil law, according to which, adultery was punished only in

¹ See P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie* (5th ed.), p. 397-407.

² *Orat.* XXXIX, 17-19.

³ In this passage Saint Gregory distinguishes six kinds of baptism : 1. Ib- baptism of Moses, *in aqua* or *in nube et in mari*; 2. that of John, *inpanitene- tiam*; 3. that of Christ, *in Spiritu*; 4. the baptism of blood or martyrdom; 5. the baptism of tears or penance; 6. lastly, the baptism of fire in the other life (ibid., 19).

⁴ See above, p. 415 and p. 430. — ⁵ Basil, *Epist.* 217, n. 73.

⁶ *Rule* I.XXIII, c. 2. See also Saint John Chrysostom, p. 492.

the case of the wife alone * Saint Gregory of Nazianzus in <me of his discourses, protests against this one-sided justice, o contrary to the teaching of the Gospela.

VI. CHRISTIAN LIFE.

The fourth-century Fathers were nearly all untiring adversaries of heresy. Certain authors have taken advantage of this trait to oppose their orthodoxy to the intensity of direct faith, that practical religion which characterised the Fathers of the preceding centuries. Such generalisations are excessive. Their insistency on orthodoxy did not destroy in them their Christian sense, nor did it neglect "religious experience"; it was added to these asa necessary complement. And as we have already seen, *Saint Athanasius*, the greatest fighter of the century, based the whole of his theology on the part played by the divinity of Christ and that of the Holy Ghost in the work of salvation in Christian life. Realising so well that dogma is at the heart of religion, he repeats incessantly that the deification of man is impossible if Christ is not God. The same ideas are to be found in the works of the *Cappadocians*.

Before attempting theology and controversy, they all endeavoured to practise Christian perfection in the monastic life, a life which may truly be said to have led them to true "philosophy". The ascetic works of Saint Basil are obviously the fruits of his own personal religious experience, and those of his brother Gregory, which earned him the title of the *Mystic*, are no less noteworthy. Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, although he has not written so much in this train, shared their secluded life, and more than in the others the contemplative life created in him a profound distaste for the active life. Even his most doctrinal treatises show, in many ways, that no matter how profound were his theological studies, they were the outcome of an intense Christian life '.

* For this question see our study, *divorce au IV^e siècle dans la loi civile et ... , avons de saint Basile*, in *Echos d'Orient*, 1920, p. 295-321.

' *Orat.* XXXVII, 6, 7. In this discourse Saint Gregory does not comment the biblical texts on the unity of matrimony in any detail, but he forcefully affirms the principle, going as far as to say that *second marriage* (after the death of the other party) is only tolerated and that a third marriage in the same circumstances is a sin (*παρανομία*). *Ibid.*, 7, 8.

'See p. III. It may be recalled that he proved the divinity of the Holy Ghost by having recourse to Christian religious experience. *Orat.* xxxi. See also *Orat.* XLI (for Pentecost), 9, 18.

They allied the depth of their Christian life to a great classical culture. Together with Saint John Chrysostom they are the pre-eminent representatives of the fusion between Hellenism and Christianity. Although they placed but little faith in philosophy in the proper sense of the word », they held in great consideration the intellectual education which it provided, and the masterpieces of the Old World in which they had learnt the arts of oratory still seemed to them to be of the greatest use to the young Christians of their time. In the famous writing in which these works are recommended ² it has been remarked ³ that Saint Basil was not thinking only of the aesthetic culture to be found in them, but also moral training in the measure that it is inseparable from a complete and sound education in the humanities «. It was at this same time that Saint Augustine in the West was making an even wider use of the treasures of classical literature, especially in his *City of God*. He noted ⁵ that there was a great deal that could be profitably used by Christians, from a moral and speculative point of view, in the School of Socrates, and especially in the works of Plato. In this respect there were very few divergencies between the Cappadocians and the Bishop of Hippo.

VII. ESCHATOLOGY.

Eschatology occupies a great place in Cappadocian theology, more especially in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa. It was on this subject that the latter was most influenced by Origen. Millenarianism, based on a too literal interpretation of the Bible, had been definitely killed by the great Alexandrian. And at this time it would seem that in the Greek Orient it was no longer thought that there was any space of time between death and the *vision of God*, for just souls ⁶

With greater precision than Origen, the majority of the fourth century Oriental Fathers teach even the material identity ⁷ of the risen body and the mortal body. *Saint*

* Exception must be made for Saint Gregory of Nyssa, as has been said above, *8 P. G.* 31, 563-590. (*De legendis libris gentilium*). — ³ *Christiis*, 1916, p. 107j.

⁴ For the same opinions in Saint Gregory, see H. Pinault, *Le Platonisme* in *Grégoire de Nazianze*, La Roche-sur-Yon, 1925.

⁵ *City of God* chiefly bk. Vili.

⁶ *Greg. Naz.*, *Orat.* vii, 21. *Greg. Nyss.*, *Orat. in funere Pulcheriae*. ¹

⁷ To Origen's mind this identity was to be attributed only to the form, since the matter was unceasingly being renewed in the body.

Gregory of Nyssa attempts to show how this is possible. He says that the soul preserves an affectionate attachment to the body which has served it as a dwelling place and follows it in the many transformations it undergoes; moreover, having received the impression of the *form* of the body, which does not change in spite of atomic transformations, the soul is easily able to recognise the body which belongs to it '.

Elsewhere, Saint Gregory describes the *state of risen bodies*; it is the state which was lost by Adam. In his description, however, he has, like Origen, fallen into an error, from which Saint Germanus of Constantinople tried in vain to exculpate him. This was the teaching of the universal restoration. His idea may be summed up as follows: "The purification of the wicked after death will be short or long according to the nature of their crimes, but in the end evil must disappear and God will reign in all; all (even the devils) will share in those good things that neither the ear nor the eye, nor the spirit of man is able to attain or understand" 2. In the fourth century, Saint Gregory of Nyssa was almost alone in defending such theories 3. Saint Basil, notably, teaches clearly the eternity of hell. Saint John Chrysostom 4 and Saint Cyril of Jerusalem 5 have the same teaching, but believe that it is possible for the sufferings of the damned to be mitigated.

CHAPTER V.

Apollinaris of Laodicea.

Special Bibliography.

Editions: P. G., 33, 1313-1538 (*Metaph. in Psalm*, and fragments).
II. LIETZMANN, *Apollinaris von L.* (Studies and Texts), Tübingen, 1904.

Studies: G. VOISIN, *LI Apollinarisme*, Louvain, 1901. J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dégni.*, II, p. 94-111.

' *Pe anima et resurrectione*. P. G., 46, 73-80. *De mortuis*. P. G., 46, SP 536.

|. Fixeront, *Hist. Dégni.*, π, p. 200.

| *Orat. catech.*, 29, 35. *De anima et resurrect.*, P. G., 46, 72, 104, 105, 15*, 157.

• /« *Philipp.*, hom. III, 4.

| ' *Catech.*, XXIII, 10.

I. LIFE OF APOLLINARIS. HIS CATHOLIC WORKS.

Apollinaris was born about 310 at Laodicea, the Syrian port in the south of Antioch, where his father, Apollinaris the Elder, a native of Alexandria, taught grammar before he was ordained priest. Apollinaris received a sound literary and philosophical education. In philosophy he was influenced more by Aristotle than by Plato. In the *time of Constantius* the Bishop of Laodicea was Arian and Apollinaris led the orthodox opposition. He welcomed Saint Athanasius, returning from exile in 346, and suffered minor persecutions himself. *Under Julian*, together with his father, he composed a number of works, not specifically religious in nature, in order to place the classical masterpieces in the hands of the young Christians and in order to militate against the effects of the Imperial laws. He also wrote against Porphyry a great work in 30 books, which, according to Philostorgius, was the most brilliant refutation of this philosopher. And lastly, he combated Julian himself, in his treatise *on Truth* 2.

It was about this time, 360-361, that Apollinaris was made Bishop of Laodicea by the Orthodox, while the Arians grouped themselves around Pelagius. His eminent qualities made him the most outstanding among the Oriental clergy. It was generally agreed that Apollinaris was extraordinarily gifted from an intellectual point of view, with a wide and deep learning both in the profane and sacred sciences. As a man of letters, exegete, controversialist, the fertility of his pen and the fine temper of his mind rendered him one of the foremost ecclesiastical writers of his time. Moreover, he seemed a man of solid piety and sincere virtue. His deep philosophical learning made him a friend of Saint Athanasius and a companion in arms of the Cappadocians in their *struggle with Arianism*. He composed a work, "Contra Eunomiūn"; he refuted Marcellus of Ancyra, and even attacked Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria, who were accused of Subordinationism.

In exegesis, G. Voisin says, "he was the unquestioned master. Equal to the Cappadocians in theology, he surpasses

■Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, nr. 16. Sozom., *Hist. Eccl.*, v, 18. The phrase of the Psalms in verse found in P. G. (*loc. cit.*) is of doubtful authenticity. —' Sozom., *Ibid.*

ilicm in his commentaries on the Scriptures, due primarily to his knowledge of Hebrew "† Saint Jerome, who came to hear him about 377, attributed to him "innumerable volumes mi the Scriptures"2. Of all these works, only citations or fragments preserved in the Catenae are extant. His commentaries give a brief literal explanation of the text and bring out the moral application.

II. THE ERROR OF APOLLINARIS. HIS CONDEMNATION.

Although his preference for the literal sense attached Apollinaris to the *School of Antioch*, his Christological ideas made him totally at variance with it. The Antiochians, by their insistency on the literal meaning of the Scriptures, had been led to place the human aspect of our Saviour in the forefront and to emphasise the *perfection of the man* Christ. Sometimes they used expressions that seemed to compromise the *personal unity* of Christ and imply that it was impossible for this perfect man to be at the same time God; this excessive dualism led indirectly to Arianism. Apollinaris regarded such a conclusion as fatal, and in order to maintain the unity of the person in Jesus Christ, in order, that is to say, to defend His Divine Personality, he thought it necessary to mutilate His human nature. He affirmed that Christ had no human soul and that its place was taken by the Word. He lacked any clear notion of *personality*. [While his refutation of exaggerated dualism was excellent, his own construction was ruinous, and he was not humble enough to submit to the magisterium of the Church when it spoke to him in the name of tradition.

It was at the Council of 362 that the two rival schools came into plioient contact for the first time. A certain disciple of Apollinaris liepmached the representatives of the School of Antioch with saying ilial "the Word of the Lord came at the end of the appointed time into th holy man, as He had come in the prophets"; the others accused him ini "attributing to the Saviour only a human body, without a soul and Iwtliout intelligence". The Council made known the true Catholic Mmtine and the two parties adhered to it. Henceforth Saint lAlh.iiiiasius was warned against the error, but not against the Bishop of gitililarea, who gave no cause for suspicion. Nevertheless Apollinaris Kill not modified a single one of his ideas and from that time continued In qn ead them.

† 1; Vo is in, *op. cit.*, p. 39. — † De viri; ill., 104.

• 2; Vo is in, *op. cit.*, p. 40-41.

First, he openly attacked the excesses of the School of Antioch, and especially its two chief leaders, Diodorus and Flavian * (*Syllogistn Discourse against Diodorus, Book to Diodorus, Against Flavian*, now all lost). Meanwhile he continued his speculations on Christ, and while he had the merit of clearly stating the Christological problem, he hail the misfortune to resolve it in the way that was condemned at Alexandria. At first he spread his doctrine secretly through his disciples, without revealing himself as their author, so that the first writings against Apollinarianism (Saint Athanasius' *Letter to Epictetus*, 371; the pseudo Athanasian *Contra Apollinarium*, 373-377; Saint Epiphanius' *Anchorata* 374) do not point directly to Apollinaris. This of course may be due only to the authors' discretion since Apollinaris' real ideas "could easily be perceived in his letter to *Jovianus* (363) and especially his letter to *Serapion* (351). Even after 374 he was still held in great esteem at Antioch.

About 375 he was finally compromised by his disciple, Vitalis a priest of Antioch. Vitalis having been denounced to the Apostolic See went to Rome, where he was at first successful in deceiving Damasus. But when the Pope, who had received more information, asked him to make a more explicit profession of faith, he refused to do so. At Antioch Apollinaris cast off the cloak and consecrated Vitalis Bishop of Antioch, as head of his own followers. Shortly after, he also raised Timothy to the See of Beryta. He thus broke openly with the Church. He was immediately denounced by the most ardent of the Nicæans, his old friends, Saint Epiphanius (*Panarion*, ch. 77) and Saint Basil (letter 263, to the West) and was finally condemned, together with his followers, by Damasus in the Roman Synod of 377. The decree was based on this fundamental argument: "Quod si utique imperfectus homini susceptus est, imperfectum Dei munus est, imperfecta nostra salus, quin non est totus homo assumptus"⁵. Various Oriental Councils received and promulgated the Pontifical condemnation, at Alexandria 378, at Antioch 379, at Constantinople 381.

Soon after 376 Apollinaris explained his teaching in a great work entitled *Demonstration of the Divine Incarnation in the Likeness of Man*, of which numerous extracts may be found in the forceful refutation by *Antirrheticus*, written about 380, in which Saint Gregory of Nazianzus showed that the author was truly a heretic. As the Apollinarists continued to spread and even called themselves Catholics, Saint Gregory of Nazianzus was obliged to take strong measures against them in Cappadocia, and Theodosius, the Emperor of the East, passed a series of decrees (383, 384, 388) forbidding their assemblies, deposing the bishops and preventing them from creating others. This opposition had an end to the progress of Apollinarianism, but did not succeed in completely destroying the heresy. Apollinaris died about 390.

* *Ibid.*, p. 168 sq. — 2 J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁵ Saint Jerome, although careful to avoid his error, had no scruple in the use of his vast Biblical erudition. *Epist.* 84, 3.

⁴ The correspondence between Basil and Apollinaris (*Ep.* 361-364) seems to be apocryphal. G. Voisin thinks it to be the work of the friend Eustathius of Sebaste: *op. cit.*, p. 237-242.

⁵ The expression *homo susceptus est*, in the sense of *natura humana participata*, was still currently employed in the Nestorian controversies.

III. APOLLINARIANISM. DOCTRINAL SYNOPSIS I. THE DISCIPLES OF APOLLINARIS.

Apollinaris was a Dichotomist during the first part of his life, and would not admit that Christ possessed any created soul. Later, having become a Trichotomist², he recognised an *animal body and soul* (ψυχή), in the human nature of Christ, but denied Him a *thinking soul*, and affirmed that the Word was His νοῦ, His πνεῦμα. The logical consequences of this theory were the following : i. The Word did not become man, but was *incarnated* in the literal meaning of the word. Not ἐνανθρωπήσῃ, but σάρκωσῃ took place. Nevertheless Apollinaris admitted the expression "perfect man" which, however, he explained in his own way. 2. It is by the *flesh of Jesus* that we are saved; our flesh is saved without us; our soul will be saved by its moral union with Christ, i. *Monophysitism* is the core and the end of the whole system : there is but one nature in Jesus Christ, without moreover any conversion of one nature into another, or the combination of two natures into a third; the Word, a complete nature, does not change, but exists "differently" in Christ; His divine nature which is ἄσαρκο becomes σαρκοῦμένη³; there is, however, but *one nature*, since the body of Himself does not constitute a nature; the union of the Word with the flesh is best explained by the union of the body and the soul⁴. 4. It follows that not only is there but one object of our adorations but also only *one principle of operation* and free activity⁶.

Other errors, such as the pre-existence of the Body of Christ, Theopaschism and Subordinationism, have been attributed to Apollinaris without sufficient grounds, although no exception should perhaps be made for Millenarianism⁷.

¹ Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 95-108. — ² By 374. See G. Voisin, *op. cit.*, p. 76-77.

His famous expression, adopted by S. Cyril of Alexandria, μία οὐσία τοῦ ἁγίου Λόγου σαρκοῦμένη, *una natura Dei Verbi incarnata* (*Epist.* xi., xi.vr, l. 1.) is not due, as Cyril thought, to Saint Athanasius, but to Apollinaris, *lit. vaticanum*, l. 1. Saint Cyril understood φύσις in the sense of *person*, but Apollinaris took it as meaning *nature* in the sense we have indicated.

³ This useful comparison had to be dropped on account of the abuse made of it by the Apollinarists and Monophysites.

⁴ It was thus that Apollinaris maintained the traditional teaching of the *communion of idioms*.

⁵ *Monothelitism* was the logical outcome of the Monophysite theory.

⁶ Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 100-102.

Apollinaris' disciples, who interpreted the teaching of the master in all its rigour and taught the consubstantiality (συνουσιωσι) of the Flesh of Christ and His Divinity, were called *Synousiastes*. They formed a kind of sect and were the real forerunners of Monophysitism. Other *more moderate* disciples returned to the Church and understood his teaching in a Catholic sense*. It was due to this group that, in spite of Imperial censures, a certain number of Apollinaris' works were preserved, bearing the names of frankly Catholic authors 1, especially *Pope Julius I* 3, *Saint Athanasius* 4, *Saint Gregory Thaumaturgus* 5. At first the fraudulent procedure was successful and Saint Cyril of Alexandria was deceived. It was not discovered until the sixth century 6. Meanwhile the work of Apollinaris, which, had it not strayed from tradition, might have borne great fruit, laid the seed of a formidable heresy which caused irrevocable divisions in the Eastern Church.

CHAPTER VI.

Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Special Bibliography : See the note for each author.

I. DIODORUS OF TARSUS'.

Diodorus was born of a distinguished family at Tarsus of Antioch about 330. He attended the schools of Antioch

1 G. Voisin, *op. cit.*, p. 112-131. — 3 *Ibid.*, p. 152-167; 182 sq.

3 *De unione corporis et divinitatis in Christo; De fide et incarnatione coniti adversarios*. Various letters (G. Voisin, *op. cit.*, p. 193).

4 *Quod unus sit Christus*. Letter to Jovianus (363-364), (not the same as Athanasius' authentic letter). *De Incarnatione Verbi Dei*.

5 A profession of faith in great detail (11 κατά μεσο πιστι).

6 The treatise *Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum* is very useful in this ΠΗ. — P. G., 86-11, 1947-1976 (among the works of Leontius Byzantinus, to which it was for a long time attributed).

7 Editions : P. G., 33 and de Lagarde, *Analecta Syriaca*, Leipzig, 1881 p. 91-100.

Studies : V. Ermoni, *Diodore de Tarse et son rôle doctrinal* in the 1901, p. 424-444. L. Mariés, *Le commentaire de Diodore de Tarse jwrl Psaumes*, Paris, 1924.

and Athens. Saint Jerome was wrong in asserting that he never studied the humanities. At the same time he cultivated the sacred sciences in which he was destined to become a master. Although greatly influenced by the learned Eusebius of Emesa, he did not follow him as far as lapsing into Arianism. On the contrary, in the time of Constantius, without separating himself from the Church, as the Eustathians had done, he gathered around him those Catholics who later came to the support of Meletius. At Antioch he founded a *monastery* (ἀσκητήριον) which he directed for some ten years together with his friend, Carterius, combining his ascetical practices with the study of religious questions¹. Among the disciples who came to him must be mentioned Saint John Chrysostom, born about 345, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, born in 350. The monastery was probably founded about 360.

Diodorus resisted Julian the Apostate with admirable energy, thus bringing down on his head the invective and insults of the Emperor. During the various exiles of Meletius, Diodorus acquired a great and useful influence in the community, so that in 363 the Bishop raised him to the priesthood. Together with Flavian, he was the strongest column of this Church. Under Valens, however, he was obliged to fly. He rejoined Meletius in Armenia and there made the acquaintance of Basil of Caesarea. On his return from exile in 378, he was raised to the See of Tarsus. He was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381, and together with Pelagius of Laodicea² was designated by Theodosius as one of the bishops with whom communion, for the diocese of the East (Antioch), would be considered as a proof of orthodoxy. He died about 391-392.

Both during his life, and long after his death, Diodorus enjoyed considerable esteem, as much for his virtue as for his zeal for learning.

It was he who in his exegesis laid down the rational principles which characterised the new School of Antioch, and thus prepared the way for Saint John Chrysostom, the most illustrious of his disciples³. To the Alexandrian allegory,

¹ At the beginning, this *asceterium* was probably no more than a kind of "Study Circle" formed with the purpose of supplementing the Christian education of chosen young men.

² U first a Semi-Arian; returned to Nicene orthodoxy shortly before this date.

³ In a discourse made in his honour Chrysostom once compared Diodorus to John the Baptist. *See G., 52, 761-766.*

Diodorus opposed *theory*, a kind of search for the spiritual sense in the letter of the Bible ¹. This may be defined more precisely as : the literal exegesis which endeavours to bring out the real sense of figurative expressions, symbols and prophecies, and to draw from the facts the moral teaching they contain. Unfortunately his dissertation "On the Difference between Theory and Allegory", which would have given us greater information regarding his method, is now lost.

Diodorus commented almost the whole of the Bible, both the Old and the New Testament. All this work is now lost save a number of fragments preserved in the *Catenae* ² and perhaps also the Commentary on the Psalms ³.

Diodorus' dogmatic work was quite as extensive as his exegesis, and has also suffered from the passage of time. Nothing remains except the titles found in Photius, Suidas, Theodoret, Leontius Byzantinus and Ebed-Jesus. We can at least estimate from these titles the wide field of his learning which enabled him to treat the most varied subjects. In addition to his controversial writings against the older philosophers, the Manichaeans, the Sabellians and the Pneumatomachi, may be mentioned two works directed against the School of Apollinaris ; *Adversus Synousiastes*; * *De Incarnatione*.

In his eagerness to maintain the integrity of the human nature of Jesus Christ against Apollinaris, he used a number of expressions which were criticised by Saint Cyril of Alexandria and which caused him to be condemned by two synods (Constantinople 499, Antioch 508); he was spared, however, by the fifth Oecumenical Council in 553. When he says that the Son of God took the Son of David and dwelt in him as in a temple, that the man born of Mary is not by nature the Son of God he speaks no differently than did the defenders of the *mere moral union* between the two natures. His declarations contain implicitly the entire heresy of Nestorianism ⁴. It is averred that Theodore of Mopsuestia did no more than develop his teaching. "Nevertheless", says L. Pimont, "it is quite possible that the disciple's errors have been attributed unfairly to the master; at the moment, it would be wiser to make no judgment which, erring either on the side of severity or indulgence, might be revised in the future". We can believe that had Diodorus foreseen the consequences of his expressions he would have disavowed them. His good faith, however, did not prevent his dangerous formulas from playing a large part in the ripening of the heresy.

¹ L. Pirot, *Œuvre exégétique de Théod. de Mopsueste*, p. 33-34.

² Found, for the most part, in *P. G.*, 33, 1561-1628.

³ See the thesis of P. Mariès, who is editing this Commentary.

⁴ *P. G.*, 33, 1550-156- (fragments).

⁵ Saint Cyril of Alexandria denounced him as the first Nestorian author. 11 extant dogmatical fragments confirm this opinion. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Lit.*, t. II, p. 12-14.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

II. THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA.

A). Life of Theodore². Controversies centred around him after his death.

Theodore was born in 350 of rich parents at Antioch, where he received a sound education. He followed the lessons of Libanius, the famous rhetor of the time. He became friendly with John Chrysostom who, at the end of his studies, persuaded him to abandon his idea of entering the legal profession and carried him off to the asceterium, directed at that time by Diodorus and Carterius (about 370). Shortly after, Theodore underwent a moral crisis, returned to the world and thought of marrying. Two urgent and moving letters from his friend brought him back to his vocation. He applied himself ardently to ascetic exercises and to study, and especially to the Scriptures, under the tuition of Diodorus, whose exegetical principles he adopted. It is from this period that dates the *Commentary on the Psalms*, a youthful work containing many rash opinions which the author soon came to regret. Theodorus was brought out of his solitude when he was ordained priest by Flavian in 383.

Theodore's priestly ministry lasted for ten years at Antioch (383-392). While John Chrysostom was becoming known as a brilliant preacher from 386 to 398, Theodore was Acquiring a reputation as a forceful controversialist and untiring fighter: he opposed the Eunomians, Apollinarists and Arians. Many disciples, attracted by his genius, gathered round him, among them John of Antioch, Theodoret and Rufinus. It is doubtful whether Nestorius was ever his disciple, although he owes all his doctrine to Theodore. The

1 ' Editions: P. G., 66. To be supplemented chiefly by Sachau, *Theodori V. suest. Fragmenta Syriaca*[^] Leipzig, 1869, and B. Swete, *Th. Flops, in fil. tolas B. Pauli Commentarii*. 2 vol., Cambridge, 1880-1882 (dogmatic li riments at the end of the second volume).

Studies : L. Piroi, *L'œuvre exéqétique de Théodore de AL*, Rome, 1913.

1 M. Voste, *La chronologie de Pactivité littéraire de Th. de Mops.*, in *Revue uh†;que*, 1925, p. 54-81. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 111, p. 14-22 (theological Inching).

I Vinong recently edited documents, may be consulted : a) *La chronique de / (Nestorian History, published by Mgr Addai Scher)*, ch. 53; P. O. y 5>

b) 1 '91 ; b) *Histoire de Barhadbesabba Arbaia*, published by F. Nau, ch. 19; p' .>. 9. 5°3-516.

great treatise *On the Incarnation* (in 15 books) dates from this period. This is Theodore's most famous work ¹.

Having become Bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia in 392, he occupied the See until 428. Little is known of his episcopate. He supported Saint John Chrysostom. He worked for the conversion of the many Pagans living in his diocese. He continued to combat Apollinarianism in his *De Assumente et Assumpto* (412-422). During the twenty-five last years of his life he seemed to interest himself again in his Scriptural works, which he had abandoned for a time. It was then that he chiefly applied his principles to the New Testament and was led into the gravest Christological errors ². He went so far as to deny the title of Θεοτόκο given to Mary : faced with the protests of the faithful, however, he made a public retraction shortly afterwards. Nestorius, who had drunk deeply of his ideas and whom he received at Mopsuestia in 428, was to act very differently. Theodore died in this same year, "happy, not only by the brilliance of his life, but also by the opportuneness of his death", wrote Facundus, his great defender. At this time he enjoyed unreserved esteem and admiration throughout the East. Even Saint Cyril of Alexandria, who was destined to combat his ideas, gave him a full meed of praise.

Very shortly after Theodore's death his works and his teaching became the centre of controversy which was to last for more than a century, until 553. Two periods of especial bitterness may be distinguished : a) from 433 to 451 ; b) from 543 to 553.

a). During the first period, Theodore's teaching was resisted with great vigour by Saint Cyril of Alexandria and Rabulas of Edessa, but defended by Theodoret of Cyprus and Ibas of Edessa, Rabulas' successor. After an especially violent attack on Theodore and his disciples by the Monophysites at the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449, his defenders, Theodoret and Ibas were personally rehabilitated by the Council of Chalcedon (451). The Nestorians mistakenly viewed this as an approbation of their doctrines and of Theodore of Mopsuestia himself.

¹ According to Syriac chronicles, it was about 392, while he was still but a simple priest, that he was called upon to dispute at Anazarbus with the Pneumatomachi, or Macedonian bishops of the region. He was named Bishop on this occasion. Later, he wrote a detailed account of this discussion in a relation addressed to Patrophilus, recently edited by F. Nau, in *A. O.*, 9, 637-667.

² On Theodore's two periods of exegetical work see J. Vosté *op. cit.* The author places the incident of the Θεοτόκο at the end of his episcopate, while other authors place it in the first part.

ι). The struggle was carried on in a desultory fashion after the Council and was fanned to greater heat chiefly after 543, when Justinian, wishing to make advances to the Monophysites, intervened and demanded the condemnation of the *Three Chapters* (Theodore, his person and his works, *Theodoret*, a number of works, and *his*, letter to Maris). In spite of Facundus' clever defence of Theodore and the opposition of the West, the Council of Constantinople (553) condemned the Three Chapters. Pope Vigilius, changing his mind for the third time regarding the expediency of the Council, finally approved it, thus rendering it Oecumenical. Theodore was personally anathematised as a heretic, whilst the various Christological and Scriptural teachings found in his works were again condemned.

B). The Exegesis of Theodore of Mopsuestia.

It is said that, like Diodorus, Theodore commented the whole of the Bible. The only works which are extant to any considerable extent are the *Commentaries** on the Psalms², and the Minor Prophets³, Saint John⁴ and Saint Paul : to these should be added various other fragments. He composed two exegetical *treatises*, now lost, one "On Allegory and the Historic Sense", and the other "On the Perfection of the Works", written against the Allegorists (in five books, of which only the titles are known).

On the whole, Theodore adopted the *principles and the rules of* the School of Antioch, but unlike Saint John Chrysostom he did not always follow them strictly; for this reason the Church has approved in the one an exegetical method it condemned in the other. The chief rule he violated was the respect for tradition. "Did not the principles of the School of Antioch and the rules of a sound historical method warn him to listen respectfully to the voice of tradition, to take the advice of his contemporaries and never to allow internal criticism to take the place of external criticism?... Theoretically, Theodore admits the authority of the Fathers and of the Councils; in practice, in his exegesis, he never takes them into account. He is rigorously and strictly personal in his work. He places too much confidence in himself, and that was perhaps the source of his errors"⁵.

* Comm. on Minor Prophets in *P. G.*, 66, col. 123-632, and fragments on N. T. in col. 633-700, the four Gospels, col. 703-786 (S. John, col. 727-786), the Acts of the Ap., col. 785-786, and S. Paul, col. 787-968.

Greek fragments edited by Lietzmann, 1902.

See Dom de Bruyne in *Revue Btnd.*, 1921.

¹ Syriac edition by Chabot, Paris, 1897. See on this treatise J. Vosté in *Bibl.*, 1923, p. 522-548.

².. Pírot, *op. cit.*, p. 209, 324. See the same opinion in Lagrange in *Bibl.*, 1914, p. 273 (notes on the work of Pírot, p. 270-275).

Theodore's *scriptural errors* regard four principal questions'.

1). On the Canon of the Sacred Books: in the *Old Testament* he rejected Chronicles, Esdras, Job, and the Canticle of Canticles, and in the *New Testament* the Epistles of Saint James and Saint Peter (2nd), Saint John (2nd and 3rd) and of Saint Jude, as well as the Apocalypse.

2). On Inspiration : against all tradition, he distinguished two kinds of inspiration; one of an inferior nature (in Proverbs, Ecclesiastes...), which is not the grace of prudence and wisdom; the other of a superior nature, which is in his opinion prophetic or true Scriptural inspiration. "In reality", remarks L. Pirot, "he only gave serious attention to this form of inspiration (prophecy) which he regards as always being produced in ecstasy and in a purely spiritual way."

3). On Messianism: In his commentary on the *Psalms*, not only did he suppress all the titles, since he regarded David as being the author of all the Psalms, but also reduced the *Messianic Psalms* to a very small number; he admitted only four in the literal sense, and three in the typical sense†. He similarly reduced the number of *Messianic prophecies*, not only in the literal but also in the typical sense. Radically prejudiced against all Messianism he interpreted the majority of the prophecies as no more than indirect predictions.

4). On the nature of certain books : He considered the Book of *Job* as no more than a drama imitated from the Pagan poets by a vain Jew, swelled with profane learning; the *Canticle of Canticles* is but a nuptial song composed on the occasion of the marriage of Solomon and an Egyptian princess.

It has rightly been said that Theodore, "intoxicated by a method of rigorously literal and historical explanation", did not "always discover the spirit which lies beyond the letter" and fell into "a certain rationalism" 4.

C) The Theology of Theodore.

He wrote widely on theological subjects. A great number of his theological works, now no longer extant, are known by their titles s.

In the Trinitarian question, Theodore took sides unequivocally against the Arians in a treatise "Against Eunomius" 6 (lost) in 25 or 28 books, which was a plea for Saint Basil, and also in another, "On tin-

11.. Pirot, *ad. cit.*, ch. iv, v, vn, vili. — 2 *Ibid.*, 175.

3 These are Psalms 2, 8, 44, and 109 in the literal sense, and Ps. 15, 54 and 88 in the typical sense. In a general way, Catholic interpreters consider as being directly Messianic in character Psalms 2, 15, 21, 44, 68, 71, 86, 95, 96, 109, 110, and as Messianic in a typical sense Psalms 8, 18, 34, 39, 40, 67, 77, 101, 108, 116, 117. The New Testament attests the Messianism of the latter as well as that of Ps. 68 and 96. Certain exegetes affirm the Messianic character of some forty other Psalms. See L. Pirot, *op. cit.*, p. 237-238 (The Psalms are numbered according to the Vulgate). — 4 L. Pirot, p. 275.

s See the list in O. Bardbnewer, *Geschichte*, in, p. 318-320. Fragments in P. G., 66, 966-1020 (*fragmenta ex libris dogmaticis variis*).

6 P. G., 66, 1001-1002 (fragments).

Holy Ghost", in which was incorporated, either as an introduction or as a conclusion, the above mentioned relation regarding his discussion with the bishops of the Pneumatomachi.

It would seem that Theodore had sympathies with Pelagianism. His teaching on grace acted as an encouragement to Pelagius; like Julian, who was his guest in 418, he destroyed the true idea of original sin and admitted the existence of carnal concupiscence in Christ; finally, shortly before he died, he wrote a work in five books "Against those who say that men are sinners by nature and not by will", written against Saint Jerome. Marius Mercator, Saint Augustine's friend, who was the first to denounce him, declared later, however, that he had retracted his Pelagianism¹.

Theodore's Christological ideas are found not only in his *De Incarnatione*², *De Assumente et Assumpto* and *Contra Iovinianum* 4, but also in his exegetical works³. They may all be summed up in the affirmation of a double personality in Christ, that of the man and that of the Word, Son of God. Although he affirms with tradition that in Christ there is "*Personal unity*, unity of sonship, of lordship, of dignity of authority and of adorable greatness", he was so eager to safeguard the perfection of the natures that, confusing the complete nature with the person, it happened that the *personal union he taught was purely moral*: "When we distinguish the natures we say that the nature of the God Word is complete, and that His Person is also complete, since it cannot be said that a hypostasis is impersonal. (Similarly we say) that the nature of the man is complete and his person complete also. But when we consider the *union* we say that there is only *one person*"⁴. This union is a *communication*, a *relation*, a *habitation* of the Word in the man, not by presence in substance (οὐσία) nor even in operation (ἐνέργεια), but by the willingness (εὐδοκία) of the Word to dwell in the man.

Against all tradition, Theodore denied the communication of idioms. It is the man alone who is the historical Christ, and the titles and the actions of the Word cannot be attributed to him. Mary is only rendered Θεοτόκο (Mother of God) by relation (that is, by metaphor); it is right to call Jesus the Son of God, but only by grace (χάρ'τι). It was not God who was born and who died, but the man, the son of

¹ J. G., 66, 1005-1012 (fragm.).

² *Liber subnotationum*, præfatio, etc. P. I., 48, 109 sq.

³ G., 66, 969-994.

⁴ G., 66, 993-1002.

⁵ Inferring from the latter part of his life.

⁶ *De Incarnatione Filii Dei*, viti; P. G., 66, 981.

David. Thus Theodore distinguished two sons in Jesus Christ; his Christology is a real hypostatic dualism '.

Such teaching, which was the whole of Nestorianism, was an absolute denial of the Incarnation and the destruction of Christianity. Theodore while remaining true to tradition on the surface really disfigured all it contained. He was led thereto, if not by a philosophical system in the true sense of the word (nature = person), at least by an inclination to submit the deposit of faith to the judgment of reason. As in exegesis, this was his great failing. Nevertheless the very evident errors of his works did not appear during his lifetime. He was regarded chiefly as an adversary of Apollinarist Monophysitism. The best minds of the time, wholly preoccupied with resisting this heresy, gave a mild interpretation to his rash assertions. But when the day came when Nestorianism had attracted attention to the value of these affirmations in themselves, their manifest falsehood was revealed to the eyes of the orthodox. That learned theologian, Saint Cyril of Alexandria, had little trouble in showing that Theodore was the true father of Nestorianism.

CHAPTER VII.

Saint John Chrysostom.

special Bibliography.

1. Edizione : P. G. 47-64 (Edit. Monfaucon, 1718-1738). *French translations* of the complete works : *by the Priests of the Immaculate Conception*, Barle-Duc, 1863-1867(11 volumes); by J. Barcille, Paris, 1864-1872 (20 volumes).

2. Studies : TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, t. XI, 1-405, 547, 626. J. STILTING, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, September, IV (1753), P- 4^oi, 709. E. Martin, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, ses œuvres et son siècle*, 3 vol., Montpellier, 1860. A. Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome* (Coll. *Les Saints*'), Paris, 1900 (5th ed. 1905).

A. Puech, *Un réformateur de la société chrétienne au IV^e siècle* (Saint John Chrysostom and the customs of his time), Paris, 1891. A. MOULARD, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, le défenseur du mariage et l'apôtre de la virginité*, Paris, 1923. Paul Albert, *Saint /iati Chrysostome considéré comme orateur populaire*, Paris, 1858 (literary

' See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*

indy). A. Thierry, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et l'impératrice Eudoxie*, l'aris, 1872. E. Legrand, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, in the Collection, *K. Moralistes chrétiens*, Paris, 1924. F. Cavaillera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, (4th-5th cent.), Paris, 1905. Dom C. Baur, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*, Louvain-Paris, 1907 (bibliographical study). G. Bardy, *Jean Chrysostome (Saint)*, in *Diet. théol.*, col. 660-690. M. Jugie, *Saint Jean Chrysostome et la primauté de Saint Pierre et Saint Jean Chrysostome, et la primauté pontificale*, in *Echos d'Orient*, 1908, two articles. Card. Marini, *Il primato di San Pietro ede suoi successori in San Giovanni Crisostomo*, Rome, 1922. P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique*, Paris, 1924, ch. V, p. 267-336.

ARTICLE I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

I. LIFE UNTIL THE EPISCOPATE (344-398).

A). Education. The Monk.

Saint John Chrysostom, the greatest Doctor of the School of Antioch, was born at Antioch before 347, most probably in 344. Secundus, his father, who held a high official position in the Empire (*magister militum Orientis*) died shortly after John's birth. Anthusa, his mother, left a widow at twenty, decided resolutely not to marry again that she might supervise more thoroughly her son's education. More fortunate than Monica, "it seemed that she had but to assist at the harmonious development of a pure soul, which worldly passions never seem to have touched" ¹ John was given a polished classical education under the best masters of the time; Libanius, of whom he was the most brilliant pupil, taught him rhetoric, and he learned his philosophy from Andragathius. It is probable that he also studied law and practised for some time.

According to the custom which he condemned at a later date, John had not yet been baptised. The Sacrament was conferred on him only in 367 or 370 by Bishop Meletius, shortly before he ordained him lector. John, however, had never neglected his religious duties. At this period he was even practising asceticism ² on the advice of Basil, one of

¹ For the sources of his life, see G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, col. 660-661, and *Catholic Encyc. (Sem. Edit.)* vol. VIH, p. 457. The best source is the *Dialogue on the life of Saint John (Chrysostom)* written before 425 by Palladius, one of the saint's friends (see p. 501). The dialogue is supposed to have taken place at Rome in 407-408 between an Oriental bishop and Theodore, a Roman deacon. — A. Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 4.

² *De Sacerdotio*, bk. I, n. I.

his friends. He remained at home, however, since his mother was averse to their complete separation'. He thus came into contact with Diodorus, future Bishop of Tarsus, and also Carterius. He followed their lessons, and, like the cultivated youth of Antioch, yielded completely to their influence. Among their disciples was Theodore, the future Bishop of Mopsuestia, whom John helped to overcome a great moral crisis by the two letters *Ad Theodorum lapsum*, or rather the second of these, since the first, even should it be authentic (doubted by some), is "a treatise on the break-up of a soul which after having vowed itself to perfection, falls into sin"; such a state does not seem to have been Theodore's 23

Meanwhile John's reputation for learning, holiness and eloquence was already great, and in 373 he narrowly escaped being raised to the episcopacy against his will. He took refuge in flight, while his friend, Basil, in the same case, let himself be consecrated 3. His retreat was only temporary. But the incident revived in him his taste for the solitary life. In 374, probably after the death of his mother, he felt himself free to pursue his desire. For four years he led a coenobitic life on the mountains in the neighbourhood of Antioch; later he spent two years as a hermit in a cave 4. His austere practices enfeebled his health and about 380 he was obliged to return to Antioch. In the following year he was raised to the diaconate by Meletius; he remained in this order for five years, joining to the ascetic exercises which his health still allowed him, a more immediate preparation for his active ministry.

From this period, the ten or twelve years which preceded his priesthood, date the majority of John Chrysostom's non-oratorical works which are still extant. They consist of treatises which reveal the secret places of his soul. At first, he was especially attracted by two subjects which are complementary by nature; monastic life and virginity 5. After his return to Antioch he began to discover new interests, of an apologetical and pastoral nature. The treatise *On the*

' *Ibid.*, n. 4-5.

■ See L. PiROT, *L'œuvre exégétique de Théodore de M.*, p. 46-48.

3 Bishop of Rhaphaia (Syria) in the opinion of Tillemont and Montfaucon. Recent critics regard all that Chrysostom says of Basil as a literary fiction. Their reasons are not, however, absolutely decisive.

4 PALLADIUS, *Dialogue*, 5. — 5 See below, art. II, p. 473 sq.

Priesthood is an especially interesting witness to that interior evolution which led Chrysostom to add the works of the *active life* to the exercises of the contemplative life. His ordination as deacon had already shown him the part he was to play. Already he was ready for the task which Providence had destined for him. "He had kept all the ardour of youth; he had acquired a deep and calm learning; he was full of zeal, full of eloquence and full of charity" ². When Flavian, Meletius' successor, finally called him to the priesthood in 386, Chrysostom was 40 years old.

B). The Priest of Antioch.

Flavian gave to the new priest the charge of preaching. John, says A. Puech, was then in the flower of his age and the ripeness of his genius. During twelve years he carried out his important functions with a talent and a power which have never been surpassed and which have earned him the title of *Chrysostom*. John preached in all the churches of Antioch and even in the chapels dedicated to the martyrs in the neighbourhood of the town, whenever ceremonies were held in them. More often, however, he preached in the (neat Church, built by Constantine, or in the Old Church in the Palaia, παλαιά) which was said to go back to Apostolic times. As a rule he only preached on Sundays, but in Lent he spoke nearly every day. Feast days or other circumstances also saw him in the pulpit. Although it was usual for him to speak to the community as a whole, there exist certain homilies addressed only to the catechumens ³.

Even from the beginning of his preaching, John must have been successful, thanks not only to his oratorical powers but also to his priestly zeal. In the following year, 387, the incident known as the statues won him all hearts ⁴. About the end of February after the imposition of certain taxes, the statues of the Emperor and his family were thrown down: this was a crime of lese-majesty that Theodosius could not allow to go unpunished. This was well understood and the town despaired. While Flavian went to Constantinople to implore the mercy of the Emperor, Chrysostom busied himself with encouraging the townsfolk. The beginning of Lent coincided with Flavian's departure.

* See below, art. II, abstract of the treatises dating from this period.

Puech, *op. oil.*, p. 32. — ³ See A. Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 33 sq.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 37 sq.

The preacher, who had planned to comment various texts of the Old Testament, often forgot his texts and made instead, allusions to recent happenings; thus it came about that the 21 sermons he preached at this time are entitled the *homilies on the statues*. "These discourses", says Villemain, "are unparalleled in antiquity". After having consoled those who had lost hope, John worked for their reformation, scourged the current vices, especially that of making vain oaths : he recalled unceasingly the vanity of the things of this world. When the first of the Emperor's delegates arrived he showed how the monks endeavoured to curb their severity'. Finally, in his twenty-first sermon, he announced the successful outcome of Flavian's mission, and repeated from the pulpit the plea that the Bishop had made to the Emperor. This discourse had brought tears to the eyes of Theodosius, and would seem to have been inspired by Chrysostom.

"*The crisis of 387*", says A. Puech, "*was decisive in the history of Chrysostom's preaching*, for it established between him and his hearers a sympathy which henceforth allowed him to say anything he desired, and disposed his hearers to listen to all he had to say. It was therefore of capital importance from the point of view of its results... After that, nearly all Chrysostom's sermons were composed on the same plan; they always contained two elements, combined in varying proportion; one part is exegetical and dogmatic, a simple, clear and intelligible teaching within the reach of all ; the other is a familiar, urgent, topical moral exhortation. But in both parts his eloquence possesses the same efficacious quality"^a.

There is no doubt that at the beginning Chrysostom thought it useful to make a direct attack on the *heretics*, Anomoeans and Judaeo-Christians. But he soon abandoned these projects in favour of the *moral education* of his faithful. After various tentatives with parts of the Old Testament, he took as the basis of his teaching whole books of the Scriptures, which he commented from the pulpit. In 388 probably, he commented the whole of Genesis. In 389 he began on the New Testaments with

¹ *Hom.* γ 17.

² A. Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 52, 40.

³ It would appear that in the preceding year he had already preached seven sermons on Lazarus and Dives according to Saint Luke; but this was not a methodical commentary of the Gospel.

the Gospel of *Saint John*; in this, signs of controversy are still evident; moral teaching, however, takes first place in his commentary of *Saint Matthew*, preached in 390. Finally, in 391, at the peak of his genius and in confident possession of his method, he began to comment *Saint Paul*, in the Epistle to the Romans. Until the end of his life, Saint Paul remained his favourite master, to whom he consecrated his finest panegyrics, and whom he had in mind at Constantinople when he commented the *Acts of the Apostles*.

During the whole of the time that Chrysostom was a priest at Antioch, there were still sharply divided factions in the town. The majority of the faithful recognised *Flavian* as Bishop, but he was opposed to *Paulinus* (d. 388), who had been consecrated by *Lucifer of Cagliari* in 362 and who led the followers of *Eustathius*. These latter were in no great number, but gloried in a past which had always been strictly orthodox, and in the support of Rome. Saint John Chrysostom, who was attached to *Flavian*, spoke violently of this faction. He never had the least word of criticism for the Holy See, but the latter's cautious attitude towards him is thus easily explained.

In reality it was he who finally restored peace to the Church of Antioch. When he was raised to the See of Constantinople, he sent to Rome a legation composed of the Bishop of Syria (*Acacius of Beraea*) and an Alexandrian priest (*Isidore*), and obtained letters of communion for himself and also for *Flavian*.²³ Union was thus established between the province of Orient and the Universal Church.

¹ It has been thought that Chrysostom denied the validity of *Paulinus'* ordinations. *In Eph.*, hom. XI, n. 4 sq. F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 271-277. This is contested by L. Sallet, *Bull. Utt. eccl.*, 1906, p. 214.

² The Faith was not in question. *Flavian*, nominated Bishop of Antioch in 381 as successor of *Meletius*, had always considered his election as lawful and never consented to submitting it to the judgment of Rome. He refused to go to Rome (382), and later to Capua (389), or to Alexandria (as was proposed by the Council of Capua). He was declared lawfully elected by a synod held at Caesarea in Palestine (393). Rome, however, was not satisfied with this, laced with *Flavian's* stubbornness she was exacting, and remained faithful to *Paulinus* and later even to *Evagrius* (388-393), although the latter was elected and consecrated, despite the canons, by *Paulinus* himself. Even after *Evagrius'* death Rome still refused her support.

³ F. Cavallera, *op. cit.* See also P. Batiffol, *Le Siècle apostolique*, p. 278-281 and 289-290.

II. BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE (398-404).

When John Chrysostom was nominated Bishop of Constantinople¹, thanks to the influence of the eunuch Eutropius, in the place of Nectarius, who in 381 had succeeded Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, it was necessary to hurry him away from the town without the knowledge of the people. Theophilus of Alexandria, although he had secretly desired the election of one of his own favourites, was prudent enough to consecrate him, and leave to a later period the chance of ridding himself of a rival. Such an opportunity was soon given him by the very fact of Chrysostom's zeal.

A). Ministry. Pastoral Activity.

From the moment of his coming to Constantinople John applied himself to the task of reforming the laxities which had insinuated themselves into his Church, *a*) First, he suppressed all the luxury of the Bishop's house; *b*) he prevented the clergy from battenning on the generosity of the rich to the detriment of the poor; *r*) he forbade virgins and deaconesses to live in the houses of the clergy on account of the peril attendant on such a custom; *2 d*) he exacted an irreproachable way of life from widows. This was to earn him the undying enmity of three among them, who later combined with Euxodia to ruin him; *e*) lastly, he reorganised the administration of diocesan possessions and gave a more ample development to works of charity.

Meanwhile he devoted a large part of his energy to spreading the Christian faith, and first of all by *preaching* to his flock. At Constantinople he finished explaining the Epistles of Saint Paul (Colossians, Thessalonians, Hebrews, 402...); he commented the Psalms in 398, and in 400 or 401 the Acts of the Apostles. As a rule these sermons are less polished than those he preached at Antioch, for his heavy duties left him less time for their preparation. Chrysostom was also eager to *spread the faith* in the country districts, which until that time had been neglected. In the town of Constantinople he attacked the Arians and the Novatians (or Cathares, rigorists); lastly, he sent missionaries to bring the Gospel to the Goths on the coasts of the Black Sea and the Danube.

¹ P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 288 sq. — * See article n, writings on this subject.

As Bishop of the capital, Chrysostom was led, not by personal ambition, but by zeal and submission to the will of the Emperor, to intervene in the administration of various dioceses of Thracia or of Asia Minor over which he possessed no direct jurisdiction. He could not evade the appeals to his charity which these Churches sent out to him. Thus in the first months of 401, in the midst of the winter, he lent his support at the Council of Ephesus which had recourse to him. He was successful in his work of bringing peace to this region, which for some time past had been troubled by a simoniacal clergy x.

B). Critical events in his episcopacy.

John Chrysostom's short episcopacy was marked by more than one critical conjuncture. The first was the fall of Eutropius. This man, the all-powerful minister of the weak Arcadius, had promoted the candidature of Chrysostom to the See of Constantinople, and later supported the Bishop in all his activities. But Chrysostom did not consider he was under any obligation to Eutropius. He reproached the minister with his outrageous cupidity. He opposed him when he desired to take away the right of asylum from the Church. Chrysostom, however, had no hand in the plot which brought about his fall in 399. After his disgrace, Eutropius fled for safety to the Church where he was received by Chrysostom, who, for the benefit of the people, did not fail to point out the moral lessons to be drawn from such a sudden change of fortune. The two famous homilies *On the Disgrace of Eutropius* describe the vanity of worldly glory with unequalled emotion, force and brilliance.

On the occasion of these sermons and others of the same nature, Chrysostom was accused of always attacking the rich without reason, and was obliged to give an explanation of his conduct. *Opposition* to the Bishop was beginning to show its head. Chrysostom, who condemned only vice and crime, did not hesitate to blame an act of injustice committed by the Empress Eudoxia, who had become all powerful at the Court after the fall of Eutropius : for this reason relations between the Court and the Bishop had been broken off from 401. They were renewed later, but a certain constraint

^x Since Chrysostom had been called in by the Council in this affair, he was acting in a perfectly lawful way, and his attitude was wrongly condemned at the Synod of the Oak. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 295-296.

remained. All those whom the Bishop had aggrieved in any way gradually combined against him. The coming of the Great Brothers (402) embittered all this latent jealousy and precipitated the crisis which for a long time had been coming to a head.²³

Certain monks of Nitria, led by what were called the Great Brothers, had been persecuted in Egypt as Origenists by Theophilus of Alexandria (401) and had fled to Constantinople. The Bishop took them into his house but not into his communion, and refused to hear a complaint lodged against them by Theophilus. But the Court, having been invoked by the refugees, summoned Theophilus to come and justify himself before the Bishop of Constantinople. Theophilus sent Saint Epiphanius before him to the capital. He had already persuaded the latter to condemn Origenism in various Councils in Cyprus and now he incited him to accuse Chrysostom of the same error. It was evident that such an accusation could not hold water; this was soon realised by Epiphanius, who withdrew.³ Others, however, less scrupulous, took his place, and when Theophilus arrived (in the middle of 403) he was no longer the accused but the accuser.

Theophilus brought twenty-six bishops with him; some ten others, dissatisfied with John, joined forces with them. He was also supported by the three rich widows, enemies of the bishop, and won over to his side the Empress, whom, it is said, Chrysostom had recently affronted by a sermon on luxury. Without the vestige of right, Theophilus called together a pseudo-synod of thirty-six bishops at the Villa of the Oak,⁴ near Chalcedon. They summoned Chrysostom to appear before them to reply to a list of slanderous and ridiculous accusations. Chrysostom naturally refused and

¹ Among these plotters may be mentioned *Severian* of Gabala (see p. a Court Bishop and favourite of Euxodia. In 401, while Chrysostom was absent, he busied himself with stirring up feeling against him, notably in his sermons, and was obliged to leave Constantinople on the Bishop's return. He was reconciled with Chrysostom later, while awaiting the opportunity of siding openly with the Bishop's enemies to procure his exile.

² See P. Batiffol for this important question, *Le Siècle apostolique*, p. 297-337.

³ According to Sozomen, he said to the bishops who came to see him as he was leaving Constantinople: "I leave you the town, the Court and the comedy. I am going away as quickly as I can." P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

⁴ Or Villa of Rufinus. *Rufinians* on the Marmora is three miles to the East of Chalcedon. See J. Pargoire, *Rufinians*, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1899, t. viii, p. 428-477. IL Leclercq, *Chalcédoine*, in *Diet. Archéol.* no-116.

was said to be deposed. He was deposed and exiled to Bythnia by the Emperor's order, but the Court, frightened by riots of the people and earthquakes, recalled him. He returned in triumph in 403. John would have wished to call a Council to reinstate him in the event that his deposition had been legitimate, but the impatience of the people left him no time for this. Eudoxia herself welcomed him joyfully, and the Bishop in his first sermon *after his return* I did not fail to make her his compliments.

The truce lasted but two months. Before the end I of 403, John was obliged to protest against the riotous I conduct which had followed the unveiling of a statue of the I Empress. Eudoxia flew into a rage and swore to make an I end of the Bishop. Chrysostom did not take back a word of I his protest, but it should be noted that the sermon in which I he is supposed to compare Eudoxia with Herodias is a I forgery composed by his enemies¹. Eudoxia consulted I Theophilus, who wrote that she should call in question I Chrysostom's re-establishment as Bishop of Constantinople. I This was the one and only reason for which the synod, B unvoiced by order of the Court, deposed John for the I second time, in Lent 404. Chrysostom refused to leave his ■ Church and was placed under arrest in his palace about I Easter time. Shortly after Pentecost, on June 20th, he was ■ again exiled.

III. EXILE (404-407).

THE CHARACTER OF SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

A). The details of the exile of Saint John Chrysostom are well known by his letters which all date from this period. I The greater number are short notes which contain news of I himself and his sufferings and give encouragement to his I friends. In finely chosen terms they exalt the sanctifying I virtue of suffering; they reveal the Saint as keenly interested B in the fortunes of his Church and the propagation of the I faith among the heathen. The same impression of calm I Mißmission to the will of God is also perceived in the two B *opuscula* written during his exile : a) "That no one can be I harmed who does not harm himself"; b) "To those who I are scandalised by misfortune" 2.

PG., 59, 485 sq.

¹ See art. *it*, the *Works*.

On leaving Constantinople, John was first taken to Nicaea, where he was able to rest for a few days while waiting to know the place of his exile. This was Cucusus, or the neighbouring fortress of *Arabissis*, on the Taurus, on the frontier of Cappadocia in Armenia. He came there after a painful journey lasting 77 days. In spite of the kindly attention of friends he suffered a great deal from the climate, lack of food, isolation and the raids of brigands. His hardships were not softened, neither by the protests of his followers (called Joannites) who for a long time refused to recognise his successors, nor by the death of Eudoxia which took place at the end of 404, nor by Pope Innocent the First's condemnation of the injustice to which he had been subjected.

John demanded the support of the Bishop of Rome (in 404) in a letter containing an implicit recognition of the superior authority of the Roman Church*. The patriarchal system was far from being able to preserve peace in the Oriental Churches¹. In this case, for instance, we see a patriarch who, despite the canons³, acting outside his territory, with no credentials and with the support of the Court, deposed the bishop of the capital. Only a religion-authority could repair such injustice. Unable to obtain the calling of a Council, Chrysostom wrote to various Western Churches and notably to Rome. Pope Innocent sponsored his cause energetically. First he prudently endeavoured to call a Council at Thessalonica, but intrigue and violence brought this attempt to naught. John was at least consoled by these efforts on his behalf, as he says in another letter (in 406). Innocent separated himself from communion with Theophilus and the usurping Bishop of Constantinople who persecuted the followers of John.

Chrysostom's enemies were suspicious of the frequent visits made to him by friends from Constantinople and

¹ *P. G.*, 52, 529-536. The fact that this letter was also addressed to the Bishops of Milan and Aquileia does not prove that John made no distinction between one and the other. It is childish to class together, from the point of view of their dignity, the Bishop of Rome and no matter what Occidental, bishop. In the case of an intervention of a religious nature in the whole world the Fathers mean Rome when they speak of the West. This is proved by the case in point. Saint Innocent I was almost alone in defending Chrysostom, in such a manner that the latter in his second letter judged it to be of *OecumenitM importance*: και γάρ ὑπὲρ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ σχεδὸν ἀπάσῃ ὁ παρὼν ἡμῖν ἀγὼν, πρόκειται. The οἰκουμένη, in the competency of Peter (See below, *7eachinx*).

³ See above, p. 305. — ³ See above, p. 441, n. 5.

Antioch and finally had him deported to Pithyus in the Caucasus. He died, worn out by the hardships of the journey, at *Comana* in Pontus on the 14th day of September, 407. His last words were "Glory be to God in all things".

The Pope demanded and obtained that his name should be restored to the diptychs. The last of his followers did not submit until the Saint's remains were solemnly brought back to Constantinople in 438 by Theodosius II¹.

B). Character of Saint John Chrysostom.

The outstanding traits of his appearance show him as an ascetic. "Chrysostom's physical appearance was small and weak; he had a pleasant but worn face, with lined forehead and bald head; his deep-set eyes were remarkably bright and penetrating. His *tastes* were of the simplest; his life one of unflinching austerity. His *nature* was *sensitive*, very open to impressions which he was able to express most vividly. Gracious, kind, affectionate and merry with his friends, he was always reserved and somewhat cold in his manner in his relations with the outside world"².

From an intellectual point of view, it should be remarked that Chrysostom was not given to *speculation* as was Gregory of Nyssa. He was in no way attracted to Origenism, and the accusations made against him in this matter were absolutely groundless. He was suspicious of philosophy, which at that time was represented by Neo-Platonism, which he regarded as the last bulwark of dying Paganism. Pagan philosophy he looked upon as a futile tissue of words and subtleties³. He had hardly need of philosophy to "discover the rational aspect of Christian truth", but was more interested in "showing how this same faith satisfied the needs of the heart"⁴. For Chrysostom, piety is true philosophy⁵.

Although he was little interested in speculation, he nevertheless possessed a clear, penetrating and lively *mind*, which enabled him nearly always to render his ideas in a style of irreproachable purity. His powerful *imagination* gave his prose an unequalled brilliance, variety and power of expression. He possessed, moreover, a perfect *sense of proportion*; thus he may be said to be a true classic, in spite

¹ See P. Batiffol for all these details and their importance, *Le Siège chrysostolique*, p. 3-334.

² J. Tixeront, *Patrologie*, p. 264-265. — ³ [*n*Joan., horn. 63, n. 1.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *List. Dogm.*, II, p. 18. — ⁵ See art. III, *The Moralist*.

of a certain *depth of feeling* or even passionate vehemence which is sometimes found in his writings. Such qualities of heart and mind have caused it to be said that he was a natural orator. In fact, the oratorical style, ample periods, ease of expression appear in all his works, even in the simplest treatises meant for reading. All these gifts have rightly earned him the title of "Chrysostom" (*Golden Mouth*) by which name he has been called since the sixth century.

Saint John Chrysostom seems to have *excelled* as a spiritual director. Although, like Saint Ambrose, he came into conflict with the civil authority he had not the same *diplomatic qualities* of the latter, who "weighed more evenly the forces he had to attack and those which he could summon to his own aid" ¹. Nor was he a *fighter* like Saint Athanasius, who would never have hesitated to defend himself against unscrupulous enemies and who would have emerged triumphant. From another point of view he is really inferior, to Saint Augustine for instance, as a *theologian*, a Christian thinker. His special gift, for which he is eminent, was *spiritual direction* ². He combined a perfect knowledge of the spiritual needs of souls with a watchful *charity*, an ardent *zeal* and absolute *unselfishness*, and boldly affirmed the rights of truth and virtue, without fear of compromising himself.

Chrysostom's great exterior activity was the outcome of a very developed interior life of the soul. There is no doubt that he was led little by little from the *contemplative life* to an intense degree of active ministry. Nevertheless, even while absorbed in the latter, the *monastic spirit* still lived in him, ³ as is proved by his evident taste for meditating even the most practical doctrine, and the ideal of perfection which he submitted to his flock under the name of *philosophy* (see article III, *The Doctor, The Moralist*).

ARTICLE II.

THE WORKS OF SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

With the exception of Origen, no other of the Great Fathers wrote or dictated to such an extent as did Saint John Chrysostom. His literary output was immense.

¹ A. Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome* p. 196.

³ *Ibid.* p. in. — ³ A. Puech, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

greater part of it consists of oratorical works. There is, however, a considerable number of his works which were not written in the form of sermons, but are rather treatises or letters, some of which are justly famous. The majority of this second class of writings was composed before the former. In this article the following will be considered :

1. Non-oratorical works;
2. Oratorical works;
3. The orator himself.

I. NON-ORATORICAL WORKS.

These may be classed under several heads according to their subject.

A). Concerning the Religious Life.

Several of the Saint's youthful works reveal what an enthusiastic yet reasonable admiration he had for this mode of life, which he himself had practised.

1. Two letters or exhortations to Theodore after his fall written between 371 and 378, have for their object to bring back to the practice of virtue one of his friends, who, after having followed the religious life at Antioch, had returned to the world. In the *first letter* Chrysostom reproaches him with having been attracted by the beauty of a young woman, Hermione, and exhorts him to return to his first fervour, by the menace of the pains of hell, the promise of the joys of heaven, and the assurance that he will be able to attain, in addition to forgiveness, a state of holiness greater than he had formerly possessed. The letter finishes with two apt instances. In the *second letter*, John shows Theodore, who had doubtless excused himself by pleading the lawfulness of married life, how uncertain are the joys of this world compared with true Christian liberty, so difficult to obtain in married life.

The two books *On Compunction*,¹ written about 375-376 or between 381-385, are very similar to the above-mentioned letters both by their subject and their tone of warm conviction. The author speaks in *Demetrius* (book I) and to *Stelechius* (book II) on the necessity and benefits of penance. It gives wings by which we can rise to a love of Christ like to that of Saint Paul (bk. I, n. 7; bk. II, n. 2). It is the very «mil of the religious life, although it may also be practised by an interior solitude made in oneself by peace of soul. David, like Saint Paul, is a perfect model (bk. II, n. 3).

¹ *I. G.*, 47, 277-316.

² *I. G.*, 47, 393-410.

Milleniont and Montfaucon propose the first date, Rauschen the second.

3. The three books *Against the Adversaries of the Monastic Life*,¹ composed at the same date ²³ as the foregoing, were written for the purpose of dispelling certain prejudices against the religious life held by both Christians and Pagans. The author drew on all the resources of his logic and eloquence in order to defend a cause which he had so much at heart. In the *first book* he shows that the enemies of the monks deserve the same *punishment* as the Jews who were enemies of Christ and of the Apostles. In the *second* he proves to a Pagan, by means of logical arguments and examples drawn from early profane writers, that the religious life, rich in virtue and wisdom, is far greater than a life spent in luxury and high public positions. Lastly, the *third book* explains to a *Christian father*, the supernatural reasons why he should allow his son to enter the monastic life (n. 1-7), his need of combining both piety and knowledge (8-12), and the superiority of a monastic education, even should it not include ordinary secular studies (13-20).

4. The little treatise on *The Comparison of a King with a Monk*³ again treats of one of the author's favourite ideas, already mentioned in the preceding work. He compares the power, wealth and prestige of a king with the life of a monk wholly given up to true *philosophy*, that is to say, the practices of the perfect interior and contemplative life. It is hardly necessary to add that Chrysostom's preferences go to the latter.

B). The Treatise on the Priesthood s.

This work is the finest of all Saint John Chrysostom's writings. It is the first really great pastoral work ever written, and is the work of but a simple deacon, for it was composed probably between 381 and 385. Although the author had as yet no practical experience of the priestly ministry, he gives to priests, wise and practical counsels couched in an excellent style, and at the same time speaks admirably of the greatness of the priest's mission. The work contains *six books*, but no methodical divisions must be looked for, since that was not the author's intention, nor

¹ P. G., 47, 319-386.

³ Same divergence of opinion as for the treatise *On compunction*.

³¹ P. G., 47, 387-392.

⁴ Adv. *oppugnatores vita monastica*, n. 6. P. G., 47, 341.

⁵ P. G., 48, 623-692. Recent edition by J. A. Nairn, *De Sacerdotio Of St John Chrysost.*, in *Cambridge Patristic Texts*, 1906.

was it suited to the Platonic form of *dialogue* he used to express his ideas.

Hook I is an introduction. After having introduced his friend, Basil, and himself to the reader, and explaining how his own desire to alter the religious state had been resisted by his mother, Chrysostom relates the scheme by which he was successful in getting his companion made bishop while he himself took flight from this onerous duty. He answers Basil's reproaches by saying that it is sometimes laudable to use innocent dissimulation in order to attain a useful end.

Books II and III are chiefly taken up with exalting the greatness of the priest. In *Book II* the author proves this greatness in a general way, by the love of Christ which is specially incumbent on the priest (n. 1), by the title of pastor which he bears (n. 2), by the strength of soul which is necessary to him (n. 3, 4), and again justifies his own conduct (n. 4-8). In *Book III* he shows that the priest is *greater* than kings (ll. 1), than angels (n. 4-5), than parents (n. 5, 6), and warns priests of the dangers of pride (n. 9, 10) and ambition (n. 11). The author is thus led to indicate the *virtues* which a priest should practise; clear and unshakable wisdom (n. 12), patience which disarms anger (n. 13, 14), and holiness which gives no cause to envy (n. 15), and lastly, exceptional prudence in the direction of widows and virgins (n. 16, 17), or in any lodgment it is necessary to make (n. 18).

Books IV and V deal especially with Christian eloquence, and contain the essential rules of *preaching*. In *book IV*, after having shown the enormous responsibility incurred by those who ordain unworthy men (n. 1, 2), he proves the *necessity* of the gift of eloquence for the priest (n. 3-9); it is by preaching that souls can be cured and corrected (n. 3), that heretics can be combated and the "City of God" defended (n. 4) and rash curiosity prevented (n. 5). Saint Paul's contempt for oratory must not be objected; although he did not practise this art as the rhetors do, he possessed in an eminent degree the power and the knowledge of the use of words (n. 6); he combined with his eloquence the power of working miracles (n. 7). His Epistles are one of the best sources of Christian eloquence (n. 8). The priest must combine the most saintly life with great eloquence in his preaching (n. 8, 9). In the *fifth Book* Chrysostom insists on the *two conditions* required if preaching is to bear fruit; *effort*, study and practice } are necessary for all and especially for those with the greater talents (n. 5) : more necessary still is *indifference to praise* and blame (n. 1, 3, 4, 6, 7); but also those with ordinary gifts must attain this indifference (n. 8). The perfect freedom of mind which results is the best guarantee of Christian eloquence.

Book VI is chiefly concerned with the priest's exterior ministry. His life is compared with that of the monk (chiefly in n. 2, 3, 6, 7, 8). The priest has a greater need of virtue; his soul must be purer than the rays of the sun (n. 2); he offers sacrifice at an altar surrounded by angels (n. 4); he is exposed to more temptations than the monk (n. 3); he has more of greater prudence, knowledge and skill (n. 5); he must always be

¹ Π τοῦ θεοῦ πόλις .

Οὐ φύσεω ἀλλὰ μαθησεω τὸ λέγειν; l. v, η. 5, col. 674.

reserved towards women (n. 2, 9); lie has particular need of zeal' (n. 10). Moreover a priest's sins are punished more heavily than others (n. 1, 11). All these ideas, which in spite of their apparent disorder are perfectly coherent, awake in Chrysostom an awe of the priesthood, produced by the consideration of his passions (n. 12) or by his magnificent conception of the Church, which is the betrothed of Christ, and of the spiritual combat, which he enchantingly describes' (n. 12). With this splendid scene the work is brought to an end.

C) Various Writings on Education and Chastity.

The five following writings of a pastoral and disciplinary nature are interesting both from a doctrinal and psychological aspect.

1. On Pride and the Education of Children, a little educational treatise, recently edited in Greek, † previously edited in Latin (*edit. Combéfis*, 1656).

2. The treatise On virginity,⁴ written about 381, is a commentary of Saint Paul's teaching on marriage and virginity (*Z Cor. vu*), marriage is good, but virginity is preferable. In later homilies on this passage, Chrysostom refers to this work.

3. The short work To a Young Widow⁵, was for the express purpose of providing supernatural motives of consolation to a lady who had lost her husband; it is less important than the following, which deals with the same subject.

4. The little treatise On Perseverance in Widowhood (*De non iterando conjugio*)", written about 380-381, counsels all widows in generiti against second marriages (The Greek Fathers in the fourth century had not all the same opinion on this point. Saint Epiphanius permits second marriages after the death of the first husband or wife, Saint Gregory tolerates them', and Saint Basil punishes them by a year of penance.

5. Two brief disciplinary treatises, dating from the commencement of his episcopate (*Adversus eos qui apud se habent virgines subintroductas*, et *Quod regulares femine viris cohabitare non debeant*)⁶, forbid, first, the virgins, and second, the deaconesses to live in the houses of the clergy, on account of the perils resulting from such conduct.

D) Writings in Defence of Religion or Providence.

All these writings may be said to be *apologetical*, although the last are especially concerned with strengthening souls in the virtue of patience.

1 "I do not think that one can be saved without having done anything for the salvation of one's neighbour"; bk. VI, n. 10, col. 686.

4 *Ibid.*, n. 12, col. 689.

3 F. Schulte, *Joannes Chrysostomus, De inani gloria et de educandis liberi*[†] Münster, 1914. — 4 *P. G.*, 48, 533-596.*

5 *Ibid.*, 599-610. — 6 *P. G.*, 48, 609-620.

† J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, p. 192-193. See above, p. 444.

“Z. G.”, 47, 495-514 and 513-532.

1. The treatise *Against Julian and the Pagans*¹, or *Book on Saint Babylas*, written about 382, vindicates religion against the attacks of the apostate Emperor, by having recourse to the miracles of the Saviour and recent prodigies which had accompanied the translation of remains of the martyrs (d. 252).

2. The work which proves *Against the Jews and the Gentiles that Christ is God*² appears to date from the beginning of his priesthood. The argument is based on the prophecies.

3. The three books *To Stagirus*³, a monk who was troubled by mental affliction of mind, attributed to *diabolical possession*, dwells on the *providential role of suffering*. This teaching, first developed in Book I, is confirmed (bks. II and III) by the example of the saints from Adam to Saint Paul. The author also includes in his works an efficacious remedy for sadness.

4. Two other treatises on the same subject [*Quod nemo laditur nisi a seipso*, and *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt ob adversitates*]⁴ «, dating from the exile, 405-406, show the usefulness of suffering and explain to weak and ignorant souls why they should not be dismayed in adversity; these works are also in some measure a defence of Providence.

E) Letters.

The Saint's correspondence contains about 240 letters, all dating from his exile (404-407). They are classed under four heads.

1. The *historical* letters, written to the bishops or to his friends, give various items of news concerning himself or his Church. The most famous are the two letters in which he appeals to Pope Innocent I.

2. The *letters of consolation* are by far the most numerous. The 17 letters to *Olympias*, a deaconess of Constantinople, are rendered especially important both by their length and their beauty.

3. The *letters of recommendation* are discreet requests to his friends for favours for the bearer of the letter.

4. The *familiar letters* were usually written to express his gratitude; they nearly always end with pious exhortations.

¹ B- G., S^o 533-572.

² G. f. 48, 813-838.

³ I' G., 47, 423-494.

⁴ P. G., 52, 459-480 and 479-528.

⁵ I' G., 52, 529-748.

⁶ See for more ample treatment Fessler-Tungmann, *Institutiones Patrologia*, II, p. 118-121.

The fine soul of the great Doctor, rendered still greater by suffering, is marvellously revealed in all his letters, which form a kind of spiritual testament.

[For the apocryphal writings see note '].

II. ORATORICAL WORKS.

Among the oratorical works of Saint John Chrysostom may be distinguished the *sermons* and the *homilies*. The latter term is applied especially to the series of methodical instructions on entire or almost entire books of the Bible. There are a number of his sermons, however, which may be classed as homilies on account of the subject with which they deal and the way in which they are treated.

A). The sermons may be classed under six heads :

1. The occasional sermons are the best known, and have already been mentioned in the article on his Life :

- a) Discourse for the day of *his ordination* (P. G., 48, 693-700);
- b) 2 discourses on the statues (A. G., 49, 15-222);
- c) 2 discourses on the fall of Eutropius (A. G., 52, 391-414);
- d) 2 discourses before and after the *first exile* (P. G., 52, 427-430, 443-448).

2. The controversial discourses date, for the most part, like the apologetical treatise "Against the Jews" which has already been mentioned, from the first years of his priesthood, 386-389; these are :

a) 12 sermons *Against the Anomœans on the incomprehensibility of God*¹ (only the last two date from his episcopate) ; these are truly remarkable works in which the great Doctor confounds the pride of the Arians, who supposed themselves

¹ Among the very numerous works which have been erroneously attributed to Saint John Chrysostom may be mentioned the following :

1. The liturgy which bears his name (A. G., 64, col. 901-922) is still used nearly every day in the year in the Byzantine rite. The date at which it was composed is not known. See Pl. De Meester, in *Χρυσόστομικά*, it, P- 245-347-

2. The manual of Biblical introduction, entitled *Synopsis Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (P. G., 56, 313-386).

3. The interesting commentary on Saint Matthew, entitled *Opus imperfectum in Matthæum* (A. G., 56, 611-946).

4. Lastly, a considerable number of homilies, found in A. G., in volumes 48, 50, 52, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64.

* A. G., 48, 701-812.

capable of rising to the height of the divine mysteries : he defends the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, and explains the evangelical expressions in which Christ declares himself to be less than the Father.

b) 8 sermons *Against the Jews* x, or rather against the Indæo-Christians, in which the preacher endeavours to bring back to the unity of faith and Christian practice those Christians who assist at the Jewish festivals or who celebrate Easter at the same time as the Jews (*Hom.* 3).

3. The name of moral discourses is especially applied to the following 2 :

rt) 2 catecheses *Ad illuminandos* before baptism (T'. G., 49, 223, 240);

b) a discourse on *the Kalends*, dealing with disorderly conduct in the New Year celebrations (T'. G., 48, 953-962);

c) 9 sermons on *penance*, preached during several Lenten seasons (P'. G., 49, 277-350 : it is not certain that the last three are authentic);

d) a sermon on *almsgiving* (P. G., 61, 261-270);

c) a sermon against *the games* in the circus and *theatres* (T'. G., 60, 263-270);

f) 3 sermons on *temptations* (P. G., 49, 241-276).

4. The sermons on the mysteries 3, which are authentic, were for the most part preached on the occasion of the great feasts of Our Lord :

a) *At Christmas* (a second sermon bearing this title is doubtful);

b) *At the Epiphany* or baptism of Our Lord; c) on *Maundy Thursday* (on Judas' betrayal, 3 sermons; the third is doubtful); rZ) on *Good Friday* (three sermons, of which the last two are copies of the first); e) *At Easter* (3 sermons; only the first is certainly authentic); f) *at the Ascension* (only the first is certainly authentic); g) *at Pentecost* (2 sermons; a third, G., 64, is not authentic).

5. The panegyrics left by Saint John Chrysostom are fairly numerous. The most famous of these are the seven preached at Antioch in *praise of Saint Paul*. Among the others may be mentioned the eulogies of three Old Testament figures (Job, Eleazar and the Machabees), the three homilies on the martyrs and the discourses on Saints Ignatius of Antioch, Lucian of Antioch, Eustathius of Antioch, Meletius of Antioch, Romanus and Barlaam.

' P. G., 48. 843-942.

the sermon *De perfecta caritate* is in all probability apocryphal (P'. G., 56, 71-290). On the contrary, the two sermons *De precatione* (among the dubia, P. G., 50, 773-786) are authentic. — ' To be found in P. G., 49 and 50.

^ All to be found in P. G., 50, where those that are authentic are separated from the doubtful or apocryphal ones. On *Saint Paul*, col. 473-514.

6. Lastly, there exist a considerable number of exegetical sermons dealing with isolated passages of the Scriptures; with the exception of seven discourses on *Lazarus and Dives*¹, they are all to be found in the same volume of the *Patrologia Graeca*². They are : «) 4 sermons on *evangelical* texts; b) 8 sermons on the beginning of the *Acts of the Apostles*, and the *name* of Paul; γ) some twenty other sermons on verses from the Epistles of Saint Paul, and a few other discourses on divers subjects.

B). Connected homilies on entire or almost entire books of the Bible form the greater part of Chrysostom's literary output. There exist almost 700 of this nature, on the Old or the New Testament.

1. There are extant on the historical books of the Old Testament :

rt) 9 homilies on Genesis (dating from 386);

b) 67 homilies on the whole Book of Genesis (probably 388);

i) 5 homilies on Anna, the mother of Samuel (387);

d) 3 homilies on David and Saul (387);

2. On the Psalms there are still extant a number of commentaries in the form of homilies 4 (on Ps. 4-12, 43-49, 108-117, 119-150). Both on account of the profundity of the ideas expressed therein and the beauty of the style these must be regarded as among the finest of the Saint's works.

3. On the prophetss Chrysostom has only left :

a) 2 homilies *De obscuritate prophetarum* (386-387);

γ) 6 homilies on *Isaías*, chap. I-vi, preached either at Antioch or Constantinople (The commentary on *Isaías*, chap. I-vi (P. G., 56, 11-94) is due to some other author).

4. Two Gospels were commented by Chrysostom :

a) The Gospel of *Saint Matthew*⁶ is dealt with in 90 homilies preached at Antioch, in 390, which are, at the same time, models of good exegesis and admirable explanations of Christian moral teaching;

0) The Gospel of *Saint John*⁷, commented in 88 homilies, which reveal traces of the author's controversy with the Arians; these homilies were probably preached in 389.

5. The 55 homilies on the Acts of the Apostles⁸ were preached at Constantinople in 415-401. Their style is less polished than that of the others, since it is probable that the Bishop did not find the time to revise them.

¹ See P. G. 48, 958-1054. — ² P. G., 51. — ³ P. G., 53 and 54.

⁴ P. G., 55. The fragments on the Proverbs, found at the end, come from the *Catena*, and may perhaps be attributed to Chrysostom.

⁵ P. G., 56. — ⁶ P. G., 57-58. — ⁷ P. G., 59.

⁸ P. G., 60. The eight discourses preached at Antioch on the beginning of the *Acts* and on the *name* of Paul are mentioned above.

6. On the Epistles of Saint Paul, Saint Chrysostom has 125 homilies*, which are rightly considered as the best commentary ever composed on the writings of the great Apostle. He began in 391 with 32 homilies on the *Epistle to the Romans*, which are regarded as the most perfect of his homilies on Saint Paul. In 392, the *two Epistles to the Galatians* were treated in 74 homilies. The 6 chapters of the commentary on the *Epistle to the Galatians* seem to be six revised homilies on this same writing. The remaining homilies on Saint Paul are as follows: Ephesians, 24; Philip-pians, 15; Colossians, 12; 1st and 2nd to the Thessalonians, 16; 1st and 2nd to Timothy, 28; Titus, 6; Philemon, 3; Hebrews, 34. The greater number were composed at Antioch, except the homilies on the Epistle to the Colossians, the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, and probably some few others.

III. THE ORATOR. NATURE OF HIS ELOQUENCE.

In a number of his especially famous discourses, Chrysostom used "a brilliant and deeply moving eloquence, which reminds one, in spite of wide divergences, of the classical eloquence of Athens and Rome, and which often enough are (his equal)". His oratorical style, however, must not be judged by these works alone, which although splendid were nevertheless the exception, although it should be said that towards the end of his life, at the time of his conflicts with the Court, the elevated style became usual with him. With the exception of his homilies on the statues, discourses on Eutropius and a number of other sermons inspired by similar circumstances, the great majority of his sermons are couched in that simple, moving and familiar tone which has made him, together with Saint Augustine, the perfect model of the (Christian preacher. It is chiefly from this point of view that he will be studied here.

To instruct and to moralise : such should be the two great ends of the preacher. Chrysostom admirably combined these two functions; better still, he seemed to instruct only to

* J. G., 60 (Epistle to the Rom.), 61 (2 Ep. to Cor. and Gal.), 62 (all the Epistles except Hebr.), 63 (Ep. to the Hebr.).

A. PUECH, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 19.

1° See G. Longhayk, *La Prédication*, Paris, 1888, p. 117-148, and A. Puech, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 33-118.

moralise. No doubt at the beginning of his preaching career he let himself be carried away by *controversy*; he fought the heretics, not only in his treatises but also in his sermons, as witness his preaching against the Anomoeans and the Jews, or his homilies on Saint John, which date from about the year 388. He was not long, however, in leaving such controversial methods in order to give himself more immediately to the needs of his flock.

Although perfect symmetry should not be looked for too closely in Saint John's sermons, it is easy to distinguish *two parts*; in the first he instructs by means of the Scriptures: he is the catechist, that is to say "a professor of elementary dogmatic and general moral theology"¹. In the second he shows his hearers how to apply the principle, "policing consciences according to their needs"². The connecting link between these two parts is often frail enough, and in certain cases there exists no other reason than the immediate need of the faithful, since the preacher was wise enough to sacrifice his art to the necessities of his ministry. More often than not, however, the two parts are merged together in perfect unity. It is perhaps in his homilies on Saint Matthew that he gave the best explanation of the moral teaching of the Gospels as a whole.

Together with Saint Augustine, Saint John Chrysostom is the *most eminent master of Christian eloquence*. Although possessing very different gifts they are both outstanding on three points.

1. The preacher and his auditors are in complete sympathy; then souls, as it were, become as one, so that the former is able to say all he feels, and the latter are willing to hear all he has to say. During the episode of the statues, Chrysostom won all hearts by his real love for his flock and his known and proven devotion to their spiritual well-being. The minor details which, in each homily, nourish this union between soul and soul, are the sign and effect of this reciprocal understanding. I

2. According to A. Puech³, "the efficacy and practical turn of his preaching is Chrysostom's most precious gift. Perhaps no one has ever had in such a degree the constant preoccupation of being so directly useful, of choosing a precise end for each of his sermons, of exercising a deep and direct influence on souls". Furthermore, this *moral pin occupation* is implemented by a very fine *psychological* insight and in that eminently apostolic gift of *exhortation* which Bossuet calls "*Z'zwiffel pation et la vigueur*", tempered, as a rule, by calm moderation and self commonsense*.

¹ G. Longhaye, *op. cit.*, p. 130. — ² *Ibid.*

³ *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 38-39. — ⁴ G. LONGHAYE, *op. cit.*, p. 142-143.

3. His gift of oratorical amplification is perhaps even more striking. His fine and penetrating mind was admirably served by a rich, opulent, and, as has been remarked, royal imagination. Images sometimes graceful, sometimes noble, always worthy, clothe, colour and animate *ideas*, which sometimes flower into long descriptions without losing any of their force; furthermore all the developments of the sermon are directed by ardent *peeling*, which suddenly rises to the most moving heights. More often than not, Chrysostom's preaching is couched in the well mannered but familiar tone of a father talking to his children.

It has been said that Chrysostom's richness of language, verging on prolixity, is explained 2, *a*) by the "wealth of his *oratorical talent*"; *b*) by the *method* he adopted (he never lacked matter to comment); *c*) by the very *tastes* of the Orientals: they loved "that clear and melodious preaching which led them ever softly on, and which could be understood without effort". But it must not be forgotten how much was due to *study* and what Chrysostom demanded even of the most gifted orator in the way of preparation 3. As to the other condition on which he seemed to insist above all, that is to say *the contempt of praise*, at the same time that it assures the orator of the necessary independence for the proper carrying out of his spiritual charge, it also leads him not only to look to God alone but also to rely on Him and find in Him the unquenchable *supernatural source* of the truth which he must announce to faithful souls. Thus we come to the study of Chrysostom as a *Doctor*.

ARTICLE III.

TEACHING OF SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

I. THE DOCTOR.

Saint John Chrysostom was more of a *moralist* than a dogmatic theologian, and even in his moral teaching he was less of a theologian than a *spiritual director*. He is famous for no very striking theories. Nevertheless the part he played as a doctor was not the less considerable, either as a witness to traditional faith or as a model of the true *pastor*, a man of doctrine; and it is especially from this aspect that he must be regarded if he would be well understood.

1 Cf. Longhaye, *op. cit.*, p. 120128.

•J. Fixeront, *Patrologie*, p. 266.

'▷◁ Sacerdotio, bk. v, n. 5. See above p. 475.

Saint John Chrysostom's orthodoxy was suspected during the Grigenist affair, but without serious reasons. Saint Epiphanius, deceived at first by the wicked calumnies of Theophilus of Alexandria, later recognised his mistake, and Theophilus himself did not invoke any of these charges at the Council of the Oak. In point of fact, Chrysostom was really attached to the anti-Origenist School of Antioch. Furthermore, a strong *sense of tradition*¹ enabled him to avoid the dangers to which the tendencies of this school were likely to lead. In Christology especially, he carefully maintained the personal unity of the Saviour, avoiding the only too precise dualist expressions of his master, Diodorus. He affirmed that Christ is one, although he compared His humanity to a temple in which He dwells. He was careful, however, not to probe the mystery too deeply. How is Christ one? Do not seek to know, he says, Christ knows³. He took the same stand in the Trinitarian question. One of the great reproaches he made to the Anomoean party was to have desired to "understand" God³. He perceived the greatness of the mystery and both his humility and his respect for tradition saved him from disaster. The *Pelagians* averred that he denied original sin; they were refuted by Saint Augustine⁴. Although it is not possible to find in his works a teaching on original sin as precise as that of the Doctor of Hippo, the doctrine of the fall of the human race is strongly affirmed.

Although little inclined to speculate on the divine mysteries, Saint John Chrysostom had nevertheless a very elevated conception of God. He was familiar with His *attributes*: but rather than subject them to theological analysis, he endeavoured to nourish the spiritual life of himself and his flock by their meditation. In all his sermons he appeals to the power and wisdom of God, to His mercy and to His love; he proclaims aloud His justice and His will; and he magnificently defends His rights. The most eloquent passages of his sermons, perhaps, were inspired by the thought of the greatness of God and the *frailty* of *creatures*, as witness the homilies on the fall of Eutrope. The realisation of the vanity of the things of this world, which is seen so forcefully in these sermons has as its necessary basis a clear understanding of God: God is the havol which knows no storm; the true city; we are only traveller! who spend but a night in an inn and then pass on⁶. It was a similar inspiration which moved Saint Augustine to his

¹ Tradition, he said, is ἀξιοπιστο ; it is tradition. What more is required?

² *II Thess.*, horn, iv, 2.

³ *In Joann.*, hom. XI, 2; *P. G.*, 59, 80.

⁴ See the discourse *Against the Anomoeans*.

⁵ *Contra Julianum* bk. 1, ch. VI, n. 22-28.

⁶ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* II, p. 143-144.

⁷ *In Eutropi* I hom. Cf. *ibid.* II, 2, 4 sq.

to God by contemplating the mutability of His creatures; but as a rule Augustine does not linger in lengthy descriptions as does Chrysostom, nor give the long proofs of the existence of immutable truth as does the philosopher, but rises immediately to the contemplation of truth¹.

Saint John Chrysostom did not seek to know how the two natures were united in Christ, but on the other hand, like a true disciple of Antioch, he insisted especially on His humanity, His life, His works and His death. Nor did he fail to exalt His *divine attributes*. His commentaries on Saint John and on Saint Paul must have necessitated his studying them, but it may be said that his exaltation of them had its deeper source in the clarity of his faith and the fervour of his love. There is no doubt that however clear was his perception of Christ's humanity he always saw Him effortlessly in the splendour of God... It has been matter for surprise that Chrysostom did not give a greater place to Our Lady in this radiance of God². Her Son never denied her; but John did not give her the title of Mother of God (θεοτόκος), which was an object of suspicion at Antioch. Sometimes indeed he supposes her to have certain human feelings which do not become her eminent holiness, for instance, a certain measure of pride in being the mother of such a Son, which caused Saint Thomas to say : *In verbis illis, Chrysostomus excessit*³.

The Holy Scriptures were the principal and almost the only source of Chrysostom's ideas. Furthermore, he made them a law for every preacher⁴. Faithful to the principles of the School of Antioch, of which he is the most illustrious representative, he preferred the literal method in exegesis. Nevertheless he tempered the strictness of this method either by having prudent and moderate recourse to allegorism, always founded on the letter, or by his insistency on moral leaching and the abundance of practical applications. "No other exegete in his interpretation of the sacred text has ever combined so much sound thought, so much calm and

¹ Although Chrysostom speaks particularly of created things inasmuch as they are possessed by man, and Saint Augustine of creatures in themselves, the very perception they both possessed of the frailty of creatures, considered from these aspects, is derived from the same source.

² I. Bardy, *op. cit.*, col. 674-675.

³ *In hi Matth.*, hom. XLIV. — *Sum. theol.*, II, q. 27, a. 4, ad 3^{am}.

⁴ *De Sacerdotio*, bk. IV.

cool commonsense, with so much abundance and depth, so much ease and skill in the fruitful application of one and the same text to all the branches of the religious life”’.

In mentioning the *sources of the teaching* of the great Doctor, it must not be forgotten that he prepared his mission by a most intense interior life, and that before he embarked on the active life he had been a *contemplative* in the full meaning of the word. It was thus that he acquired that *eminent conception of God* which was to be for him the very mainspring of his life and the source of his preaching, directing him in his essentially practical and moral apostolate, as it directs others, gifted with other talents or other duties, in the path of speculative or doctrinal research. Saint Augustine, for instance, and Saint John Chrysostom, so different in many ways, may well be compared, not only by their love of God but by the great knowledge of Him they both possessed, and which they both found in the peace of the monastic life. There it was that Chrysostom discovered *true philosophy* which he made his ideal, to be realised in the work of moral and religious education which he undertook’.

II. THE MORALIST.

Moral teaching is always the end and nearly always the main subject of the preaching of Saint John Chrysostom. His intention was to submit the whole of man, the individual, the family, society to the Christian law. In the fourth century, manners and conduct were still feeling the effects of Paganism. As yet they had not been entirely changed by the Church. At that time the moralist had also to be a *reformer*. At Antioch, Chrysostom found his task easy. At Constantinople he met with a powerful and tenacious opposition which broke him in the long run. But no matter how difficult and dangerous his task, John never flinched from carrying it through. As A. Puech says, his work is like “a complete manual of Christian life”, in which “he himself appears as one of the best spiritual directors who ever lived, not only a director of a few chosen souls but also of the whole of a great city”⁴. His ideas on certain points, especially characteristic of his method and general plan, may be noted.

Among the isolated sermons, those which are especially termed moral discourses have already been mentioned: several of them deal with *penance* and with *temptations*. The homilies “On the Statues” are an energetic attack on the custom of taking *oaths* without sufficient reason.

¹ O. Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, II, p. 179. — ² See p. 488.

³ See A. Puech, *Un réformateur*, and also *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, p. 55-111.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

which was an inveterate habit at Antioch (*horn.* m-xvi, xix, xx). *Drunkenness*, which is scourged in the first of these homilies (n. 4-5), is also dealt with again in the homilies on the Kalends, on the Resurrection, on the martyrs, etc. But it would seem that the orator desired above all to destroy those vices which are contrary to charity and the sacredness of family life.

Saint John Chrysostom was pre-eminently the apostle of charity. In his homilies on Lazarus and Dives he soundly whipped the vice of *avarice*, and sang the praises of almsgiving in moving accents. As A. Puech remarks, "his eloquence was inexhaustible when he had to deal with this subject". He who gives to the poor gives to God, and anticipating Bossuet, John found words to exalt the "eminent dignity of the poor". He was so zealous, and sometimes railed so violently against riches that he has been pictured "as a kind of demagogue, explaining and arguing social questions from the pulpit". And it is a fact that several of his texts seem to imply the denial of the right of private property. But instead of advocating class warfare, his only goal was to impress on the wealthy the need to be charitable and practise almsgiving. He kept within a moral rather than a juridical sphere. He was sincere in saying that the poor had a certain right to share the wealth of the rich, but this must be taken in a very large sense. His attitude to *slavery*, which he did not condemn², but whose hardships he endeavoured to mitigate, also prove that he was far from being a revolutionary.

Saint John Chrysostom, who held the celibate life in the highest esteem, never condemned *marriage's* absolutely, but he embraced the task of sanctifying family life by suppressing many blamable laxities; he exhorted young people to marry young; he forcefully attacked many Pagan customs which still existed in the married state; he clearly affirmed the perfect equality of husband and wife, insisting on the good influence each one can have on the other. He recommended the Christian *education* of children, and seems to have been little interested in the use of the Pagan classics. He deprecated the employment of professional mourners and

¹ A. Puech, *S. Jean Chrysostome*, p. 58-72. —a *Ibid.*, p. 72-77.

M. Moulard (*op. cit.*) insists particularly on this latter in the first part of his *Introduction* and explains that this is really the Saint's opinion, in spite of exaggeration. It is to be found in certain of his more youthful works, which exalt *virginity*. In the latter indeed, the glory of monachism¹, supposes the practice of all the moral and social virtues and primarily that of charity.

other customs not worthy of Christian funeral ceremonies. He always severely condemned *theatres*, the *games in the circus*, and public shows which he declared to be a menace to family life

With regard to Christian life *in the -proper sense of the word*, John first endeavoured to *preserve the faith* of his flock by carefully instructing them in the truths of religion; he warned them against the dangers of Paganism and more still of heresy, against which he was extremely severe. As for the *practice of religion*, he blamed the custom of postponing baptism, recommended frequent communion, fasting, frequent private prayer by day and by night, and assistance at the ceremonies. He stressed the preparation necessary before Mass and Holy Communion, and the duties of preachers in this respect (for instance, in the homily entitled *Non esse ad gratiam condonandum*, P. G., 50, 653-662).

Saint John, who seems to have dreamt of establishing in the world, by means of charity, a certain community of possessions similar to that of the monks³, also planned to revive the *monastic ideal* in the Christian family by the *spirit of prayer*, to transform the house of the Christian into an "academy of philosophy", since the woman who lives therein in peaceful contemplation can "apply herself to prayer, to reading and all other philosophy"⁴ or pious exercise. Philosophy, he says elsewhere, does not mean that one must fly to the mountains and the deserts. Solitude, and even the interior life, must be brought into the cities by the practice of virtues. Saint Francis of Sales in his "Introduction à la vie devoute", had a similar teaching. The influence of Greci sources must not be exaggerated in Chrysostom's conception of philosophy; the real sources of his ideas were profoundly Christian.

III. TEACHING ON GRACE, THE SACRAMENTS AND THE CHURCH.

A). Grace⁶. Saint John Chrysostom explained the problems of grace chiefly from a moral and ascetic aspect!

¹ See principally the 3 *homilies on marriage* in P. G., 51, 207-242; and lint homily *Contra circenses ludos et theatra*, P. G., 56, 263-270. See idwi A. Puech, *S. Jean Chrysostome*, p. 77'95. Henriette Dacier's book, *Α.κ.Α Jean Chrysostome et la femme chrétienne au IV' siècle*, Paris, 1907, is a pious and artistic work meant especially for women.

² A. Puech, *S. Jean Chrysostome*, p. 96-111.

³ "Utopia of course", writes A. Puech, "but a Utopia of peace and love, of sacrifice and poverty". *Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁴ *In Joann.*, horn. I.XI, n. 3. — ⁵ *In Pom.*, horn, xxvt, n. 4.

⁶ G. Bardy, *op. cit.*, col. 677-679. J. Tixeront. *op. cit.*, p. 146-147.

The doctrinal precision of Saint Augustine, who studied them as a theologian and adversary of heresy, must not be looked for in his writings. Chrysostom brings out quite clearly the part played by *free will* in the work of sanctification, but he is also far from neglecting the importance of *grace*.

1. No salutary act is possible without grace. It is to grace and not to human efforts that the principal role (τὸ πλεόν) should be attributed; race, however, does not do all (τὸ πᾶν) ■; he seems to mean not only that man, being free, retains the power of refusing grace, but that perfect Christian life supposes two distinct and convergent activities, that of God and that of man'.

2. Grace is a free gift. God vouchsafes it as He wills, according to His will and His foreknowledge (κατὰ προῤῥῆσιν καὶ πρόγνωσιν) A God's choice is subject to His goodness and to man's virtue. *Predestination* (in general) is the result of both one and the other; Chrysostom expressly states that both are necessary; if it were only a question of love all men would be infallibly saved.

3. Chrysostom distinguishes two kinds of will in God : *voluntas prima*, by which God wills sinners not to perish ; *voluntas secunda*, by which He wills them to be punished. They are not lost by necessity, but by God's will, armed with justice !. Saint John Chrysostom was the first, it would seem, to propose this distinction of two wills, a theory developed by Saint John Damascenus⁶, and made more precise by Saint Thomas⁷.

This teaching on grace, which is a fair outline of the *Greek school of thought*, lays especial stress on God's goodness which calls all men to salvation, His *foreknowledge*, and His *justice* which rewards and punishes⁸.

B). The Sacraments. In the fourth century there did not yet exist any general theory on the nature and the number of the Sacraments. Saint John Chrysostom explains that God gave to man "the intelligible in the sensible", or, in other words, grace in visible and palpable *signs* or *symbols* which we call Sacraments. Like Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, he speaks of a *character* (σῆμα σφραγὶς) impressed by baptism, confirmation and order; he reminds his hearers that in the administration of the sacred mysteries, God or Jesus

¹ *In Rom.*, hom. XIX, η. 1 : (τὸ πλεόν τῇ χάριτι ἢν, οὐ τὸ πᾶν).

² *In Philipp.*, hom. Vin, n. I, 2.

³ *In Rom.*, hom. xvi, n. 6.

⁴ *In Eph.*, hom. I, n. 2. — ⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Defide orth.*, il, c. 29, towards the end.

⁷ *Summa theol.*¹ I, q. 19, art. 6, ad lum.

⁸ Saint Gregory of Nazianzus, who was a lesser moralist than Chrysostom, insists to a greater degree on the part played by grace. They are lixth surpassed in precision by Saint Augustine.

Christ is the principal agent, and the priest is no more than the instrument. For this reason he affirmed, with Saint Augustine, that the validity of the Sacraments does not depend on the personal holiness of the priest who confers them, and thus brought sacramental theology " nearer to the doctrine of *ex opere operato* ").

1. Baptism. Although Chrysostom did not formally distinguish six species of baptism¹ as did Gregory of Nazianzus, he indicated the effect² of the first three better than either Gregory or any other Oriental Father. The baptism of the Jews, he says, went no farther than the body; that of John remitted sin only by means of the contrition which accompanied it (*ex opere operantis*); but the baptism of Jesus remits sin of itself and confers the Holy Ghost³. Furthermore, he refrained from the practice of rebaptising not only schismatics but also heretics, or at least those who professed a false Trinitarian belief. This practice was still widespread in the East, and especially in Cappadocia where it had been forbidden by Saint Basil⁴.

2. Confirmation. In addition to what is said by Saint Cyril on this subject, Chrysostom observes that only the Apostles conferred the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. This remark may have been caused by a custom, then beginning to spread in the East, since the creation of rural parishes, of allowing the priests to perform not only tin-baptismal unctions but also the unction which followed baptism and accompanied the laying on of hands, and which constituted the Sacrament of Confirmation⁵.

3. The Holy Eucharist. The title of *Eucharistic Doctor*, *Doctor Eucharistice*, is given to Saint John Chrysostom. The texts found in the writings of the fourth century Fathers, bearing witness to the Blessed Sacrament, are numerous and explicit. The Real Presence, in particular, is clearly taught by all. No one spoke more forcefully than Chrysostom on this subject. While Saint Cyril of Jerusalem employed certain expressions which have caused certain critics (erroneously, to judge by his teaching as a whole) to doubt his faith in the Real Presence — for instance, the words similitude, antitype, figure, which he applied even to the consecrated species — Chrysostom, like the true Antiochian that he was, showed a daring and almost exaggerated realism |
 4 We do not go only to see Our Saviour, we also take him in our hands, crush His flesh, unite ourselves to Him in the

¹ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, p. 162-163.

- *Oral*. XXXIX, 17, 19. See above p. 444, note 3.

³ Hom. *De baptismo Christi*, 3; A. G., 49.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, p. 169.

⁵ G. Bareille, *Confirmation*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1038.

closest way... That which Our Saviour did not suffer on the (toss (i. e., the breaking of not one of his bones), He suffers to-day in the Sacrifice for the love of you, and allows Himself to be reduced to fragments so that all may be filled "x.

The sanctification of the offerings is not only called a change (μετασκευή) or transformation (μεταρρυθμισμό) by Chrysostom, but more precisely a conversion (μεταβολή). In this respect Saint Gregory of Nyssa is still more complete, and attempts a theory of conversion to which he applies the significant word, *trans-elementation* μεταστοιχείωσι '.

Saint John Chrysostom usually attributes transubstantiation to the words of *Jesus Christ*. The priest at the altar stands in the place of the Saviour and pronounces His words: "This is My Body, he says; these words transmute (μεταρρυθμίζει) the offerings" 3. Nearly all the other Oriental Fathers attribute transubstantiation to the invocation of the Holy Ghost (epiclesis) which follows the consecration. Chrysostom also does this occasionally: the reason is that for him as for the other fathers the epiclesis was the exterior manifestation of the action of the Holy Ghost, to Whom are attributed all sanctifying works, and this action, they supposed, takes place at the moment when, on the invocation of the Holy Ghost, the words of Our Lord at the Last Supper are repeated; the Fathers considered the successive invocation of the Three Persons as constituting a *moral whole*., during which, at some precise instant, the consecration took place

Lastly, Saint John Chrysostom is one of those who have stressed most insistently not only the principal part taken by Jesus as the minister of the Holy Eucharists but also the identity of the Eucharistic feast with the Last Supper, and the identity of the Sacrifice of the Mass with the Sacrifice of the Cross 6.

4. Penance. Saint John Chrysostom often spoke of *penance* and the moral conditions it requires, but some have mistakenly regarded him as affirming the efficacy of penance 7 without confession made to a priest. But his insistency on confession made to God should not be taken as excluding sacramental confession; moreover, even the Fathers who wrote most explicitly on confession to a priest (Origen, Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine, Saint Leo) often speak in the same way as Chrysostom, and he himself was far from

' *In Joann.*, Hom. XLvi. n. 3. *In I Cor.*, Hom. XXIV, n. 2.

See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 182-183.

De prodit. Juda, hom. II, 6.

' See S. Saia vii. I.e., *Epiclese eucharistique*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 194-300, lin. 13-14 col. 236 sq.

De prodit. Juda, hom. I, 6.

|| *In I Cor.*, hom. xxiv, I, 2, 4.

' See in particular the nine discourses on *Penance*.

being unacquainted with the ministry of the priest¹. At *Antioch* he affirmed the priest's power of remitting sins and laid on the sinner the duty of confessing his sins to him", At *Constantinople* things were not quite the same; in 391. Nectarius had suppressed the office of penitentiary and also probably public penance, on account of a scandal that had arisen. Nevertheless Chrysostom still taught³ in this town that penance requires: «) the accusation and detailed confession of sins; heartfelt humiliation and contrition; c) satisfaction made by prayer, tears and almsgiving. It is true that he does not mention the priest, but one of the accusations made against Chrysostom at the Villa of the Oak, that of having promised forgiveness to all sinners whenever they should come to him, supposes the intervention of the priest in the Sacrament of Penance; private and not public penance is here in question. It would certainly have been re-established by the bishop had it fallen into disuse⁴.

5. Other Sacraments, à) Saint John Chrysostom says nothing of *Extreme Unctions*.

b) As regards *Order*, he especially exalted the greatness of the episcopacy and the priesthood in his book, "De Sacerdotio".

c) *Marriage*. He insisted on the equality of husband and wife⁶; he maintained the unity of the marriage bond by not approving second marriages and chiefly by forbidding married couples who had separated from marrying again, even in the case of adultery. This applied not only to the wife, who, although repudiated, still remained the wife of the injured husband⁷ but also to the latter who is obliged, if he has "taken to wife a woman filled with vice, to support her" by living with her". Separation is only allowed in the case of adultery, and Chrysostom declares: "It is forbidden to him, who has repudiated his wife and lives separately, to take another; that would be adultery". Other less precise explanations of the same doctrine must be understood in the light of these clear affirmations.

C) The Church. Like other fourth century Fathers, Chrysostom had not developed a complete ecclesiological

¹ See P. Galtier, *Pénitence*, in *Diet. apol.*, col. 1847-1861.

² *De Sacerd.* III, 6; *In Genes.*, hom. XXX, 5; *De panil.*, viti, 2; etc.

³ *In Hebr.*, hom. IX, 4-5.

⁴ See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Degni.*, n, p. 187-190. P. Batiffol, *EludicThist. et de thiol. positive*, I, 149 sq.

⁵ This Sacrament was nevertheless mentioned at this period in the *Euchologion* of Serapion of Thmuis (XXIX, the prayer in *oleum agroloruni*). See p. 371.

⁶ Even as regards guilt in adultery: *In 7hess.* hom. v, 2 (very important), j

⁷ *In Maith.*, hom. xvn, 4: "καὶ γὰρ ἐκβληθεῖσα μένει τοῦ ἐκδαλόντος οὕσα γυνή". See also *De libello repudii*, π, i, 3.

⁸ *In Maith.*, hom. Lxn, 2 (end). — ⁹ *In Joann.*, hom. I x iii, 4.

leaching. Those points on which he did touch, however, are valuable.

1. The Church is founded on **truth**¹; it is therefore infallible in its magisterium, which constitutes one of its primary obligations.

2. It is independent of secular power. The prince has power only in temporal things; the power of the priest as minister of the Church is far greater².

3. The Church is *one* and *universal*. Made one by the will of Christ, it cannot be divided; schismatics do as much harm as heretics³; the Church Catholic or universal is the mainstay of the whole world⁴.

4. The Church is founded on Peter. It is probable that no one in the fourth century has so well sung the praises of the privileges of Peter as Chrysostom, in his commentaries of those texts of the Gospel which refer to them, and even the texts which tell of Peter's denial of Jesus⁵. Christ gave to him not only the power of teaching the truth and the presidency of honour (τιμ.ῆ) but also the efficacious government of the whole Church⁶, of the whole world⁷.

During all the time that Chrysostom was at Antioch, the strained relations existing between the bishop of that town and the Church of Rome did not allow him to speak very openly of the privileges of the successor of Peter: he did so *indirectly* by comparing Peter's successors with himself. But from the moment of his own elevation to the episcopacy he acted as peacemaker between Antioch and Rome, and when he was unjustly deposed he had recourse to the Pope in order to obtain a revision of the condemnation of which he had been the victim. In spite of certain appearances to the contrary, this appeal to Rome possessed a capital importance, if its circumstances and its result are considered⁹. Innocent I at least obtained the posthumous rehabilitation of the greatest of the *Oecumenical Doctors*, as they are termed in the East. In the full meaning of the word, Chrysostom was an *Oecumenical Doctor* and *Catholic Doctor*.

¹ *In I Tim.* XI, i. Ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια ἐστὶ τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ σῦλον καὶ ὁραῖωμα.

- *In illud: Vidi Dominum*, boni, iv, 4, 5. See the development of these ideas from a spiritual standpoint in the *De Sacerdotio*, III, I, etc.

³ *In Eph.*, XI, 5, 6. See F. CAVALIERA, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, p. 271 sq.

⁴ *In I Tim.* XI, I. Σῦλον ἐστὶ τῇ οἰκουμένη ἡ Ἐκκλησία.

⁵ *In Matth.*, hom. Liv. *In Joann.*, hom. Lxxiii and Lxxxviii. Etc.

⁶ *De panil.*, hom. III and V.

⁷ τὴν ἐπιστολίαν τῇ οἰκουμένη Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐνεχείρησε. *De pan.*, hom. v

(n. 2) 3 4 5 6 7 8

⁸ τῇ οἰκουμένη τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀναδέχεται. *In Joann.*, hom., I. xxiii (n. I).

⁹ For all this question, the studies mentioned at the head of this chapter, at the end of the *bibliography* (Marini, Batiffol and M. Jugie) should be consulted.

CHAPTER Vili.

Secondary Oriental Authors.
Bishops and Monks.

Special Bibliography. See the note for each author.

I. BISHOPS, FRIENDS OR ADVERSARIES
OF SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

1. Evagrius (d. 393), the successor of Paulinus of Antioch, composed divers treatises and translated into Latin the *Life of Saint Anthony* by Saint Athanasius (The translation is still extant)¹.

2. Flavian of Antioch² (d. 404), successor to Meletius, left to posterity a still extant sermon on charity, and fragments of other sermons.

3. Acacius of Beroea³ in Syria (d. 432), who was first one of Chrysostom's friends but later became his unrelenting enemy, like the two following authors left a voluminous correspondence, of which only three letters and a brief *Confessio* *β/ιεiare* now extant. He was a zealous man but lacked judgment.

4. Antiochus of Ptolemais (Saint John of Acre) (d. 408) wrote various treatises which are now lost. One discourse only is preserved. He lived at Constantinople, where he was in great favour as a preacher. According to Sozomen, he was called Chrysostom by his friends⁴.

5. Severian of Gabala in Coela-Syria (d. after 408). This other disloyal friend of Saint John Chrysostom, who plotted against him in his own house, was, according to Gennadius of Marseilles, famous for his eloquence and his knowledge of the Scriptures⁵. His *Expositio in Ep. ad Galatas* is lost, as well as another of his commentaries. There remain extant : a) 6 homilies on the creation of the

¹ P. G., 26, <838-976. On Evagrius, see Hieron., *Deviris*, 125; F. Cavaillera, *Ç. firome*. I, p. 21-22, etc., *Le Schisme d'Antioche*, ch. IX and *passim*.

² See in particular chap. vu, S. John Chrysostom, p. 463 and 465. Homily on charity in P. G., 48, 945-952 (entitled *De anathemate*, among the *Op. Chrysosl.*); correct attribution made by Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, p. 15-19, 277-282. This author also attributes other fragments to Flavian : P. G., 83, 77, 204; 86, I, 1313; π, 1840.

³ P. G., 77, 99-102 (letter); 84, 647, 660 (letters), 851-854 (Confessio).

⁴ *Hist. Eccl.*, vili, io. The discourse is found among Chrysostom's work», Saviles' edit. 1612, v, 648-653. Divers fragments are preserved in quotations, *s De vir. ill.*, 21.

6. Macarius Magnes⁴, or *Macariás of Magnesia*, in Lydia, was also present at the Villa of the Oak among Chrysostom's enemies. In addition to a few homiletic fragments, the *Monogenes* (Unigenitus) or *Answer to the Greeks* (*Apocriticus*), a *eiKa.t* apology in five books, written about 410, in which the objections of the Neo-Platonist, Porphyry, are refuted, is also attributed to him.

See the following chapter for Palladius.

1. Gelasina of Cæsarea (d. 395), nephew of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, has left no extant works, although it is known that he composed various treatises, and also perhaps a no longer extant continuation of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History*.⁵

3. Philo, Bishop of Carpasia, in *Cyprus*, in the time of Epiphanius', about the year 400, was the author of a commentary on the Canticle of Canticles, extant in Latin and in a Greek abridged version. An ascetic letter, found in Saint Basil's" correspondence, was attributed to him, but in reality it was written by Saint Nilus.

-*Ibid.*, P. G., 52, 425-428 (recently edited Greek text); 56, 499-516, 563-564; 59: 587-590; 64, 793. 802; 63, 531-544; 65, 15-26.

³ One is S. Basil's (*P. G.*, 31, 423-444); another S. Peter Chrysologus' (*J. G.*, 65, 27-28). See O. Bardenheuer, *Geschichte*, m, p. 363-365. See also M. Jugie, *Sylviéti de G. et le symbole aihanasién*, in *Échos d'Orient*, 1911.

i. B. G., 10, 1345-1406 (fragments). C. Blondel, *Mae. Magn. qua supersunt*, laris, 1876 (complete edit.). See L. Duchesne, thesis, Paris, 1877.
ii. Barty, *On the Apocritics*, in *Bull. Anc. Litt. el Arch.*, /913 (p. 95-m). See also O. Bardenheuer, *op. cit.*, tv, p. 189-195.

Photius, *Cod.* 89. See also Hieron., *Deviris*, 130.

^u Preserved by Saint Jerome in *Contra Joannem Hierosolym.* and *Ep.* 82.

¹ Text, with the other extant fragments, in Caspar!, *Geschichte des TauJmbols*, 1866, I, p. 161-212.

5 mystagogical catecheses composed by S. Cyril of Jerusalem have been attributed to him on insufficient grounds. See S. SALA VILLE, in *Echos d'Orient*, 1015 (Sept.), p. 531-537.

“Triphylus, Bishop of Kedra, famous for his eloquence, lived under Justinian.”

■» *P. G.*, 40, 27-154.

¹⁰ P- G., 32, 347-360. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, hi, p. 303.

4. Theophilus of Alexandria was the third successor (1) Saint Athanasius (385-412), after *Peter II* (373-381) and *Timothy* (381-385), and also uncle to Saint Cyril. This sorry figure of a bishop, who has often been referred to in the foregoing pages, probably wrote a great deal (exegetical and oratorical fragments, and a pastoral canon extending from 380 to 479 are quoted), but hardly anything except his letters now remains: a) a synodal letter against Origenism, sent out to 400 bishops of Palestine or Cyprus; b) Paschal letters for the years 401, 402, 404, 5 c) five or six other letters or fragments of letters; d) a violent pamphlet against Saint John Chrysostom 2.

5. Polyhronius of Apamea³, Syria (d. 428-431), was brother in Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a fertile exegete. Numerous scholia on Job, Ezechiel and Daniel are extant. He does not seem to have fallen into his brother's errors although he also was attached to the School of Antioch.

6. Asterius of Amasea, Asia Minor, was famous as a preacher about 400, and has left a collection of 21 homilies, discourses and panegyrics⁴, to which should be added 2 sermons wrongly attributed to Saint Gregory of Nyssa⁵. The subject matter is chiefly of a moral and pastoral nature. His style is fairly pure.

III. BISHOP PHILOSOPHERS.

Nemesius, Bishop of Emesa, in Phoenecia, at the beginning of the fifth century, was the author of a work *On the Nature of Man*⁶. This is a psychological work, with Neo-Platonic tendencies. A fragment of it is found among the works of Gregory of Nyssa entitled *De Anima*. This treatise was in great demand during the Middle Ages.

Synesius of Cyrene⁸, Bishop of Ptolémaïs, metropolis of Cyrenaica, was always more of a philosopher than a Chris-

¹ P. L., 22, 758, 773, 792, 813. P. G. 65, 33-60.

² Translated by Saint Jerome, together with the Paschal letters. See L. Cavallera, *Jérôme*. It is to be regretted that Saint Jerome abetted Theophilus to such an extent.

³ O. Bardenhewer, *Polychronius*, Freiburg im B. 1879. Fragments in P. G., 162, 607-712 (lost). See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, III, p. 322-324.

⁴ P. G., 40, 163-478 (Combes' edition).

⁵ *Adhortatio ad penitentiam* and *In principium jejuniorum*, P. G., 46, 539 mj. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, III, 228-230.

⁶ P. G., 40, 503-818. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, IV, 275-280.

⁷ P. G., 45, 187-222.

⁸ Editions: P. G., 66, 1053-1616 (Petavius' edit., 1633. For the "In Praise of Baldness" (*Encomium Calvitii*) see Krabinger's edit.). French trans., H. Druon, Paris, 1878. Studies: II. Druon, *Étude sur la vie et les œuvres de Synésius*, Paris, 1859. C. Vellay, *Étude sur les hymnes de Synésius de Cyrène*, Paris, 1904. Fr. X. Kraus, *Studien über Synesios von Pyrene*, in *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1865-1866, 3 articles. O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, IV, p. 110-112.

lian. Born of rich parents about the year 370, and brought up at Alexandria in an intense literary and philosophical atmosphere, he was initiated by the famous Hypatia to the mysterious doctrines of Neo-Platonism. On his return from a long and successful mission to the Court of Arcadius he settled at Alexandria, where he married. Between 406 and 415, his compatriots desiring him to be made bishop, he consented after some resistance, and governed the Church of Ptolemais very zealously until his death in 415. As bishop his Christian faith predominated, although his religion never went very deep and traces of his Pagan studies still clung to him. In reality he reduced Christianity to a highly spiritual Ethic.

Synesius' works include : a) 6 purely secular *treatises*, written before he was a bishop b) 9 complete *discourses* and 2 homiletic fragments; 10 *hymns* on religious subjects, in a classical style; only two, however, are frankly Christian (num. 7 and 9); if) 156 *letters* dating from 399 to 413. These are very finely written and are rendered highly important by the diversity of subjects they treat, especially the history and geography of the Libyan Pentapolis or Cyreniaca.

Although Synesius was a great stylist, he occupies but a minor place in the history of Christian thought. He may be regarded as a forerunner of many writers of our own time, who after having carefully sifted out what they call the "metaphysics" of Christianity, retain only a vague idealism. He himself destroyed nothing, but he never fully possessed the true Christian spirit. He kept well out of the current in which the Fathers were moving. His influence was never strong, since he failed to use his really brilliant literary talent in the service of a solid and powerful teaching.

IV. MONASTIC EXEGETES.

The majority of the monks who made a name for themselves in exegesis became bishops. Some, however, remained monks all their lives. The next chapter will deal with those whose work was chiefly ascetic and mystical, while two who wrote on exegetical subjects will be mentioned here.

' For instance the *Enconium Calvitii* (satire on futile philosophers), *Dionysius* (vindication of his manner of living), *De Insomniis* (their cause and importance).

' A. G., 66, 1587-1616.

' G., 66, 1321-1560. R. Hercher, *Epistolographi grati*, Paris, 1873, I* f° 38-739, gives 159, but the last three are not authentic.

1. Adrian or Hadrian, probably an Antiochian monk in the first part of the fifth century, has left an outstanding work entitled *Introduction to the Divine Scriptures*, the first known work of this kind. The author explains the principles developed by the School of Antioch, and studies the characteristics of Hebrew literature with reference to its themes, vocabulary and construction. Fragments of this author's work are still to be found in the Catenae.

2. Saint Isidore of Pelusium (d. about 449) priest and abbot of a monastery situated near this town (which drew its name, $\pi\eta\lambda\acute{o}$, *mud*, from the swamps bordering the Nile at its Eastern mouth)³, was also an exegete of the School of Antioch; he was a disciple of Saint John Chrysostom, living on the Alexandrian side. 2000 of his letters are still extant⁴, the finest collection of this nature still in existence. This cultured author (according to Photius his elegant unaffected letters are a model of the epistolary style) was a theologian and philosopher as well as an orator. He combated all the heretics of his time. He was especially fond of *exegesis*, of which he even developed a theory, and stood out firmly against Alexandrian allegorism. He refused notably to apply the whole of the Old Testament to Christ, since he regarded a part of it as purely historical. He was interested in *moral theology*, which he taught; as a philosopher, disciple of Aristotle as well as a Christian, *Virtue* he placed above all things: ἀρετὴ ἴσον οὐδέν (nothing is equal to virtue), he says over and over again⁷. Together with the four cardinal virtues, he recommended liberality, magnanimity, affability and social service⁸. It is natural that as a monk he stressed the need of the ascetic life⁹ in order to reach perfection: voluntary poverty and abstinence constitutes "the philosophy of the disciples of the Lord", and he placed virginity, which, however, he did not separate from

¹ A. G., 98, 1273-1312.

³ G. Mercati. *Pro Hadriano*, in *Revue Biblique*, 1914, p. 246-255.

³ E. BOUVVY, *De S. Isidoro Pelusiota* (thesis), Nîmes, 1884, p. 74-78.

⁴ P. G., 78, 177-1646. Five books containing respectively 500, 300, 413, 2, and 569 letters. On this Corpus, see O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, iv, p. 10.

⁵ Photius, *Epist.*, bk. II, 44. See also L. Bayer, *Isidore von P. klastia Bildung*, Paderborn, 1915.

⁶ *Epist.*, iv, 117; II, 195; in, 339. See L. Bober, *De arte esegetica S.* Cracow, 1878.

⁷ See E. Bouvy, *op. cit.*, p. 103-105, etc. See the whole of the chapter p. 102-126.

⁸ On his "politics" see E. Bouvy, *ibid.*, p. 78-85. See also E. Lyon, *Le droit chez Isidore de Peluse*, Paris, 1913.

⁹ O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, iv, p. 103-104.

humility and the love of one's neighbour far above the married state. Such is the teaching that will be found in all the monastic literature.

CHAPTER IX.

Oriental Monachism.

Special Bibliography : see the notes.

I. OUTLINE OF MONACHISM.—HISTORIANS OF MONACHISM.

A). General Outline. In the fourth century, chiefly in the East, monachism spread rapidly. Although peace had finally come to the Church, it was far from lessening the attractions that many felt for the solitary life, but rather strengthened and increased it; this goes to prove that the deserts had not been peopled by those who fled from suffering, but by those who felt the need for a greater exterior peace which they could not find in the promiscuity of the cities. The monks who lived in most of the Eastern countries have already been mentioned in passing:

η) In *Egypt*, with Saint Anthony (in the life of Saint Athanasius);

II) In *Palestine*, with Saint Epiphanius;

Γ) In *Eastern Syria*, with Saint Ephraem and Aphraates;

δ) In the *region of Antioch*, with Diodorus, Theodore and Saint John Chrysostom;

Ε) In *Asia Minor*, with Saint Basil.

This visible spread of monachism was accompanied by a magnificent flow of *literary works*, to mention only the very many ascetic works composed by Saint Ephraem, Saint Basil, Saint Gregory of Nyssa and Saint John Chrysostom.

I *Studies on S. Isidore. Besides the authors mentioned and BAR DENEWEER, *B. it.*, iv, 100-107, see H. A. NIEMEYER, *De I. P. vita, scriptis, et doctrina* (Ib. II, 1825 (Zl. G., 78, 9-102); and P. GLEK, *I. P. Stimma doctrina moralis*, Ibi bipoli, 1848.

But *Egypt* was the real home of monachism. There it was that the most diverse organisations took root, and there, or in the neighbouring regions, that the most original ascetic works were written. These will be dealt with. First, however, it would be well to speak of a number of ancient and especially interesting *historical studies*, dealing with the outstanding monastic figures of the time as well as with monachism in general.

B). Lives of the Fathers of the Desert. These Lives have long been rendered popular in the East, in works translated from the Greek, of which an important collection was made at the beginning of the seventeenth century by the Dutch Jesuit, Father Rosweyde, of Utrecht. This collection, which Father Delehaye terms "the dawn of Bollandism", is reproduced in Migne's *Patrologia L*. It is extremely voluminous and fills no less than ten books and three appendices.

In the first, the compiler has brought together several famous *biographies* of the monks (Saints Paul, Anthony, Hilarión, etc) and *religious women* (Saints Eugenie, Euphrasia, Euphrosyne, Mary the Egyptian, etc.), composed by various authors. The second book contains the *Historia monachorum in A-egypto*, attributed to Rufinus of Aquileia, while in book iv are found extracts from Sulpicius Severus and Cassian. Books iii, v, vi consist of collections of sayings due to the more *flamboyant* solitaires. Book vii contains the earlier accepted text of the *Lausiac History*. Books IX and X relate respectively the monastic history of Theodoret of Cyrus (entitled Theophilus) and Moschus history entitled the *Spiritual Meadow*. In an appendix is found a writing entitled the *Paradise* of Heraclides, another text of the *Lausiac History* and another collection of sayings. But even this great work was far from including all that had been preserved of the copious literature on the subject. Other texts have since been edited, and in modern times still more have been published, notably in Coptic.

As may have been remarked, all these documents may be classified under two heads: a) some are *historical relations*, or biographies details; b) others consist of collections of sayings, or *Apophthegmata* and the most famous collection is called *Αποφθέγματα αγίων γερόντων*. Books III, V, vi, vii and the third appendix of Rosweyde's work will under this latter head.

Since these latter writings are, for the most part, posterior to the period now under discussion, they will be dealt with later in Book iii. Moreover the essential parts of their contents are to be found in Theodoret's contemporary Latin work, which is our best source of information on Oriental monachism. As for the historical collections, only two may be studied here. These are the *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, attributed to Rufinus, and the *Lausiac History*.

¹ P. L., "I" (bk. I-viii) and 74 (bk. IX, X and appendices).

² COTRILLER, *Ecclesia graece monumenta*, I, 338-712. In P. G., 65, 71. ||

The *Historia monachorum in Ægypto* 1 was for a long time regarded as one of Rufinus' original works. At present it is almost certain that Rufinus' text is only the translation 3 of an anonymous Greek work, dating from the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth. The Greek text has even been determined by means of the reconstitution of the text of Palladius' *Lausiaca History*.

C) Palladius 3 (about 363-425). Palladius, a native of Galatia, became a monk at Jerusalem about 386, where he lived for three years. He then passed over to Egypt, where he lived for another three years at Alexandria. This was followed by nine years spent at Nitria, during which time he explored the monastic solitudes of the Upper Nile. About 400 we find him as Bishop of Helenopolis in Bithynia. A great friend of Saint John Chrysostom, he went to Rome in company with several others of the clergy, after the Synod of the Oak, in an attempt to obtain the support of the West. As a punishment he was deposed and banished to the Thebaid at Syene, where he passed six years (406-412). On his return to Galatia he became Bishop of Aspsundia in his own province and died in this See. He is known, however, as the Bishop of Helenopolis. His fame is based on the following works: 1. *Dialogue on the Life of Saint John Chrysostom* 4, probably composed in Egypt about 407-408. This is one of the most valuable sources for S. John's life at Constantinople; 2. The *Lausiaca History* 5, that is to say, the history of the monks dedicated to Lausus, the Chamberlain of Theodosius II and composed in Galatia about 420,

The *Lausiaca History* from the very moment of its appearance became immensely popular, due to its charming ingenuousness and the curiosity of the fifth century Christians concerning anything todo with monastic life. The work gained nothing by its success, for it was not only reproduced and translated, but also added to by copyists and translators. At one time it was notably increased by the addition of the

¹ Latin text, *P. Z.*, 21, 387-402 (*Op. Rufini*).

Before the appearance of Dom Butler's thesis, Preuschen (*Palladius und Iulianus*, Giessen, 1897) maintained that Rufinus' text was really the original, and the Greek text only the translation. This opinion was supported by Kchzenstein in 1916 (*Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca*, Gottingen). Iludenhewer remarks, however, that Dom Butler's position is in no way V' deened. See *Geschichte*, tv, p. 149, n. 1.

³ Most of the biographical details are drawn from the *Lausiaca History*.

⁴ *G.*, 47, 5-82 (at the beginning of the *Op. S.J. Chrysostomi*).

Rosweyde's text of the *Vita Patrum* is now advantageously replaced by that of Dom Cuthbert Butler.

Historia monachorum in Ægypto, and still retained this form at the end of the nineteenth century. An early translation of the primitive text was extant under the title of "*Paradise*", bearing the name of Heraclides, *Paradisus Heraclidis*. Heraclides, secretary to Saint John Chrysostom, by whom he had been made Bishop of Ephesus, was regarded as the author. Tillemont recognised the composite nature of the *longer* compilation of the *Lausiæ History* but went no farther. Dom Cuthbert Butler the English Benedictine, rendered justice to Palladius by showing : 1. That he, and not Heraclides, was the author of *Paradise*; 2. that the *Paradise* contains the fundamental elements of the *Lausiæ History*, from which must be separated the *Historia monachorum in Ægypto*; 3. that the latter is not Rufinus' work, but a translation made by him of a Greek work⁸, probably written by Timothy, an archdeacon of Alexandria, about 425. These conclusions are now commonly admitted.

Thus reconstituted, the work possesses a real historical value. Its author was a bishop honoured with the friendship of Saint John Chrysostom, and a monk who spent the greater part of his life in the midst of the solitaries of whom he writes. His work possesses exceptional authority inasmuch as it completes and confirms the accounts found in the biographies of the founders of monachism, and is a powerful aid to the proper understanding of monastic literature itself.

II. THE MONASTIC LAWGIVERS³.

Monachism developed in a double form ; the *anchoretic life*, that of the solitaries or hermits, often living in the same place, but not bound together by a common rule and exercises, and the *coenobitic life*, that of monks living in community in the monasteries⁴, under the authority of superiors. The first lawgivers left a number of writings which should be mentioned here.

A). Anchoretic Life.

The very first founder of the anchoretic life, in Egypt, where it first flourished, was Saint Anthony. He was born

¹ Dom Cuthbert Butler, *The Lausiæ History of Palladius*; I. A critical discussion; II. The Greek text, in *Texts and Studies*, VI (Cambridge, 189N 1904).

⁸ The Greek text was re-edited by Preuschen, *op. cit.*

³ Towards the end of the nineteenth century the rationalists refused to admit that the first writings on monachism possessed a historical value. At present they can no longer maintain their assertions.

⁴ The term, *monastery*, which etymologically is better suited to the mode of life of hermits or anchorites, has come to mean a house where the coenobitic life is practised.

about 250 in Middle Egypt near Heracleopolis. From the age of twenty he lived as hermit near his village; fifteen years later he withdrew to the East, still in Middle Egypt, towards the Red Sea, in the mountains of Pispir, where many solitaries came to learn from him of the anchoritic life: about 340 he went further into the deserts of the Eastern Thebaid (towards the Red Sea) was present at the death of Saint Paul, the first hermit², and died himself in 356. The story of Anthony's life was written by Saint Athanasius, who quotes an entire *discourse* (n. 16-43) *n which the great anchorite is supposed to give an outline of all his teaching. It is a fact that the discipline he imposed on his disciples was all of a spiritual and ascetic natures, such as is found in these pages. His only extant writing is an authentic *letter* addressed to the Abbot Theodore and his monks⁴; seven other letters, known by Saint Jeromes, seem to have been lost, for the seven extant letters in Latin⁶* do not appear to be the same collection. All the other writings, sermons, rules and even treatises, edited under his name, are to be rejected as *apocryphal*!. The instructions he gave to his monks are lost, with the exception of Saint Athanasius' quotations⁸.

The anchoritic life also flourished in Lower Egypt in three principal legions; to the south of Alexandria, in the direction of the Western desert, and on the confines of Libya:

1. First, in the valley of Nitria, where Saint *Ammon* (Ammonius) was the first to go (about 325), followed later by several thousand monks;
2. still farther, the desert of the Cells, where dwelt the famous *Macarius of Alexandria* (d. 394);

Egypt: as is well known, contains three parts: *Lower Egypt*, in the North, near the Delta of the Nile, where Alexandria, Cairo and Memphis are found; in the centre, *Middle Egypt*, whose chief towns are Heracleopolis, to the south of Memphis, and Lycopolis and Panopolis, near the Thebaid; lastly, in the south, *Upper Egypt* or The thebaid, the district of Thebes, capital of the region which borders Ethiopia. Monachism flourished in all these regions.

Since he always lived apart, Saint Paul did not influence Anthony, who maintains the true patriarch of monachism. His life is known chiefly from Saint Kime's account. *P. L.*, 23, 17-28. See F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme*, 1, 43-45- z

Z. G., 26, 838-976 (Latin trans, by Evagrius of Antioch). See above, p. 494.

G., 40, 1065-1066. — s *De viris ill.*, 88.

P. G., 40, 977-1000.

P. G., 40, 961 sq.

At first the only bond of union among the anchorites was the counsels given by the "Elder". Soon, however, a general meeting (*synaxis*) was instituted in the prayer of Saturday and Sunday. On *Saint Anthony*, see J. David, in *D/ < /l. Hist.*, col. 726-734.

3. lastly, on the confines of the great Libyan desert, the mountain of Seete, peopled by monks attracted by the reputation of *Macarius the Egyptian*, or Macarius the Great (300-390).

B). Coenobitic Life.

Coenobitism, in the real meaning of the word, was established by Saint Pachomius¹ (292-346) in Upper Egypt in the heart of the Thebaid. About 320 he settled upon one of the islands formed by the Nile, well above Thebes, at *Tabennisi*, where he founded community life, characterised by submission to a rule and the recognition of true superiors. Thanks to firm disciplinary measures he was able to gather together several hundred coenobites in a single monastery, and other houses were soon founded united under the authority of a superior general. About the year 400 they already contained nearly 5000 monks². The *Rule of Saint Pachomius*³, written in Coptic, is preserved in Saint Jerome's translation, made about 404; in addition to prayer and fasting, it prescribes manual labour and the study of Holy Scripture. In Saint Jerome's work⁴ are also found the *Monita Pachomii*, spiritual exhortations, and SS. *PP. Pachomii et Theodori epistolee et verba mystica*, containing 8 of Pachomius' letters, one of Theodore's, and three series of "verba

Theodore (d. 368) was one of Saint Pachomius' chief disciples; another of his letters is still extant. *Horsiesi* (d. 380), who shortly after Pachomius' death took his place as superior general⁵ (347-380), wrote a treatise entitled *Doctrina de institutione monachorum*⁶ in 56 chapters, containing spiritual advice proper to the life of Pachomian monks; he laid especial stress on religious poverty and detachment from wealth. Within the last forty years a considerable number of Coptic documents

* *Vita S. Pachomii* (trans. by Dionysius the Less), *P. G.*, 73, 229-271. *Histoire de S. Pachôme* (French trans. from the Syriac version by J. Bousquet and F. Nau), *P. O.*, 4, 425-503. Capital introduction, p. 409-424. See P. Ladeuze, *Étude sur le cénobitisme pachomien*, Louvain, 1898.

² Saint Jerome (Preface to the translation of the Rule) speaks of more than 50,000, but this number in Mgr Ladeuze's opinion is exaggerated (p. 204-205). The central monastery seems to have numbered 600 monks, divided into groups each under the control of a special superior; according to Saint Jerome there were 30 to 40 houses in each monastery.

³ *P. L.*, 23, 65-86. See Mgr Ladeuze, *op. cit.*, p. 274-305. L. T. I. κ1 οκβ. *La Règle de S. Pachôme*, Mustion, 1924, p. 1-28.

⁴ *P. L.*, 23, 85-100.

⁵ At Horsiesi's request he was succeeded by Theodore as superior general from about 350 to 368, on account of the former's difficulties with certain monasteries on administrative questions.

⁶ *P. G.*, 40, 869-894. See Mgr Ladeuze, *op. cit.*, p. 114-115.

On monachism have been published. But their real origin and value have not yet been definitely established'.

Coenobitism also put on other forms differing from that of Saint Pachomius. Even in Egypt quite near to Tabennisi, at *Atrib*, the coenobitic rules' were modified by Schenoudi³, (339-451) in his famous *White Monastery*, which also had its affiliated houses although less numerous than in the other congregation. Schenoudi's reform entailed a greater length of time devoted to prayer, greater austerity in nourishment, and stricter discipline, enforced if necessary by corporal punishments. In other countries coenobitism underwent even greater transformations, especially in Cappadocia with Saint Basil⁴ and in Latin Africa with Saint Augustine⁵.

By the side of these communities of men, feminine monastic institutions, were found everywhere in Egypt. These were entirely separated from the former but were modelled on the same plan, organised for the anchoritic life, or in the manner of the Pachomian monasteries. They received their spiritual direction from the great founders.

III. — ASCETIC LITERATURE.

No mention will be made here of the anonymous collections of Apophteg'mata, or *Spiritual Sayings*, of the bathers of the desert, since these compilations, for the most part, took on their definite shape during the next period. Furthermore, their essential content is to be found in Cassian's work. It is necessary, however, to touch upon the work of a number of more especially famous Oriental monks, who, together with Saint Basil and Saint John Chrysostom, are the accredited representatives of Eastern ascetic teaching in the fourth century. Four names are particularly outstanding: Saint Macarius the Great and Evagrius Ponticus, in Egypt, Saint Nilus in Sinai, and Mark the Hermit in Asia Minor.

Saint Macarius the Great⁶, or the *Elder*, also termed the *Egyptian* (300-390), spent sixty years of his life in the terrible desert of Scete, and acquired among the monks of Lower Egypt a considerable reputation for wisdom and

³ Several have been edited in the *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire* notably by M. Amélineau. This author has also published a number of tendacious studies on Egyptian monachism. He accuses the majority of Pachomian coenobites of immorality, and also most of the Egyptian monks by insinuation. Mgr Ladeuze has proved that these malicious accusations are baseless. *Op. cit.*, p. 327-361. See also F. Nau, *in P. O.* 4, 419-420, *Rev. Or. chrét.** 1907, p. 326 sq.

P. Ladeuze, *op. cit.*, p. 305-326. — 3 *ibid.*, 206-221.

⁴ See above, p. 412. — ⁵ See p. 412.

⁶ E. Amann, *Le Vicaire d'Égypte*, in *Did. théol.*, 1452-1455.

eloquence. A great number of works bearing his name are still extant, but their authenticity is unfortunately still under discussion.

a) 50 sermons, styled *spiritual homilies*', as remarkable for the vividness and purity of their style as for the nature of their teaching. To these should be added seven recently edited homilies'; 4) a series of 7 opuscula closely related to the homilies. The authenticity of these works has been in question for a considerable period. Fr. Stiglmayr³ in 1912 supposed them to be a Byzantine work anterior to the tenth century. Dom Villecourt maintains that the homilies date from the fourth century⁴ but considers them as being an *Euchite* work, and even perhaps those from which the condemned propositions of these false mystics were extracted⁶. In any case it seems very doubtful whether they can still be attributed to Macarius. All that can truly be said to remain of his work are a letter (*Ad filios Dei*, to the young monks⁷) and some *Apophthegmata* which although he may not have written them himself are a true account of his teaching.

This *Macarius the Great*s should not be confused with *Macarius the Alexandrian*, also called δ πολιτικὸς ΙΟ, likewise a priest, and monk of Nitria, who was famous for his austerity, but who has left no writings. The *rules* 11 (for the coenobitic life) which have sometimes been attributed to one or the other Macarius are evidently apocryphal and should be rejected.

Evagrius Ponticus 12 (345-399) was born at Ibora in Pontus (hence his name), was ordained deacon at Constantin-

¹ P. G., 34, 449-822.

² G. L. Mariott, *Macarii Anecdota*, Cambridge, 1918.

³ *Sachliches und Sprahliches bei Makarius von Ägypten*, Innsbruck, 1912.

⁴ *La date et l'origine des Homélies spirituelles attribuées à Macaire* (Extract from the *Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. Insc. Belles-Lettres*, 1920, 8 pages).

⁵ On this error see above, p. 303, η. i.

⁶ The similarities mentioned are many and striking. Even the title of "Spiritual" Homilies is significant. Nevertheless, it would appear that these homilies have at some time been subjected to an orthodox pruning, which would explain the considerable popularity they have enjoyed.

⁷ P. G., 34, 405-410. *Ibid.*, two other letters, 409-442 and 441-444 1114 doubtful.

⁸ P. G., 34, 235-262 or 65, 257-282. Coptic texts edited by AmÉti.inica iu in *Annales du Musée Guimet*, xxv (1894). By the same author, *Vie A S. Macaire de Scété; Vertus de S. Macaire* (translated Coptic text, *ibid.*)

⁹ *Lausiaca Hist.*, 17; *Hist. monadi.*, 28.

¹⁰ *Lausiaca Hist.*, 18; *Hist. mon.*, 30.

¹¹ P. G., 34, 967-970 and 971-978.

¹² Editions : P. G., 40, (fragments). B. Sarghisean, Venice, 1907 (Armar nian translation of his works). W. Frankenberg, Berlin, 1912 (Syriac trans.), *Λ Studies*: P. Godet, *Evagre*, in *Diet, théol.*, col., 1611-1612. O. Bakuk - hewer, *Geschichte*, HI, p. 93-98. W. Bousset, *Apophthegmata*, Tübingen, 1907 J. Lf.HRF.TON, in *Rech. Sc. Rei.*, 1924, p. 362-364.

ople by Saint Gregory Nazianzen about 380 and visited Palestine about 382, where he saw Melania the Elder. He spent his last years in retirement at Nitria (383-399). He was highly educated and exercised considerable influence. He was an ardent *origenist*, a fact which lessened his reputation, since his errors were condemned later by the Fifth Oecumenical Council (553); he was also anathematised together with Origen and Didymus at the Sixth and Seventh Councils. His works, however, still partly remain in translations. He wrote a great deal, but only for the monks. In consequence his works possess a very special character.

Evagrius' known works are fairly numerous.

a) The *Antirrheticus* (reconstituted from Latin and Syriac fragments) contained, in eight books, the Scriptural texts on the eight vices that man must combat in order to repel the devil¹.

b) Four collections of *Spiritual Sayings*, are entitled respectively: 1. the *Monk* (too chapters); 2. the *Gnostic* (50 ch.); 3. *Maxims for Monks*; 4. *Maxims for religious women*.

c) The *Gnostic* or scientific *problems* (6 groups, each of too maxims) is a kind of dogmatic or moral theology. (A treatise on the ἀπάθεια is no longer extant).

4) Lastly, the eighth *letter* of Saint Basil's correspondence should be attributed to Evagrius². It is rendered of capital interest from a theological point of view as well as by the exhortations to perfection that it contains. The author shows himself to be a fervent disciple of Origen. In general he is not wary enough of the dangers inherent in the master's mystical teaching.

Saint Nilus of Sinai³ (d. about 430?). According to the traditional biography, he was an officer at Theodosius' Court and Praetorian Prefect. About 390, together with his son, Theodulus, he withdrew to Mount Sinai, where he embraced the monastic life until his death about 430. All these details are found in a collection of 7 *Narrationes de aede monachorum et de Theodulo filio*, which are attributed to him, and in which he recounts the Saracen invasion of Sinai, the slaughter they wrought and the imprisonment of his son, to whom he was united again at Elusa, where they were both ordained priests. The authenticity of this account, however, is very doubtful⁴.

¹ fragments, in *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus*; P. G., 40, 1271-1278.

² Creek edition of this and the foregoing collection, by H. Gr BSSMANN, Leipzig, 1913.

Thesis by R. Melcher, Münster, 1923.

³ Edition: P. G., 79, 81-1280. Studies: O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, IV, 178-179. IR. Degenhart, *Der hl. Nilus von Sinai Askete in Texten u. Unters.*, Leipzig, 1917. — s. Against Degenhart, Heussi styles it a novel.

According to the earliest documents, Saint Nilus should rather be regarded as the superior of a monastery of Ancyra in Galatia. He was a faithful disciple of Saint John Chrysostom and a zealous apostle of the ascetic life, very well read and learned in the Scriptures. It would not appear that he was a priest.

His literary production is considerable, and, on the whole, seems to be authentic, although critics have not yet pronounced the last word on the subject. It may be grouped under three heads.

«) Saint Nilus' correspondence includes 1061 letters', and with the exception of a few doubtful elements the authenticity of the whole is not in doubt. They deal with dogmatic, moral and exegetical questions. Many of them are no more than quotations from earlier authors, such as S. Basil, S. Irenaeus, etc. This work, which is equal in volume to that of Saint Isidore of Pelusium, is only inferior to it by the literary style.

b) Several treatises deal with the Christian virtues and have thus a general interest. Such are : 1. the *De oratione*²; 2. the *De octo spiritibus malitia*³; 3. the sermon on the purse, the cloak and the sword (Luke, XXII, 36)⁴; 4. the instruction *Ad Eulogium monachum*⁵ which deals with the pursuit of perfection and the fight against evil⁶.

c) Other treatises deal more immediately with monachism. These are: 1. *Oratio in Albanum*³; 2. *Liber de monastica exercitatione*⁷, 3. the treatise *De voluntaria paupertate*⁸; 4. *De monachorum prastantia*⁹; 5. a recently edited "opusculum *De magistris et discipulis*. To these must be joined a few collections of sayings

Various works known to have been written by Saint Nilus are lost. Others are wrongly attributed to him. Those that are extant amply bear out the author's great reputation.

Mark the Hermit³ (beginning of the fifth century), a contemporary of Saint Nilus, and also, it is thought, one of Chrysostom's disciples, also appears to have been superior of a monastery at Ancyra. He ended his life as a hermit in what is thought to have been the desert of Juda in Palestine. He wrote considerably. A theological treatise against the

¹ P. G., 70, 81-582 (four books, the first three containing 333 letters, and the last 62. — P. G., 79, 1165-1200.

³ P. G., 79, 1145-1164. The treatises *De octo vitiosis cogitationibus* (col. 1435-1472) and (probably) *De malignis cogitationibus* (col. 1199-1234) are not authentic.

⁴ P. G., 79, 1263-1280. — 3 P. G., 79, 1093-1140.

⁶ The long treatise *De virtute colenda et vitio fugiendo* (P. G., 79, 811-968) is not authentic. — 1 P. G., 79, 695-712.

⁸ P. G., 79, 719-810. — 7 P. G., 79, 967-1060. — 10 P. G., 79, 1061-1094.

⁹ By Van DEN Ven, in *Mélanges Godefroid Kurth*, Liège, 1908, 2, p. 73-81.

¹⁰ P. G., 79, 1239-1250, 1249-1264 (except n. 1-24); 40, 1263 etc. (intei *Evagrii*).

¹¹ Edition: P. G., 65, 903-1118. Studies: E. Amann, *Alare ΓΕ/ηι'Α* in *Diet, thiol.*, 1964-1968. O. Bardenheuer, *Geschichte*, iv, 178-186. J. Kunze, *Markus Eremita*, Leipzig, 1895.

Nestorians seems to be doubtful, but a work *On Melchisedech* against those who then affirmed that Melchisedech was the Person of the Word is still extant. His chief work, however, is a series of very precious *ascetic opuscula*, of which the authenticity appears to be fairly well established *.

a) Two series of sayings (*De lege spirituali*, 201 sayings, and *Contra justificationem ex operibus*, 211) remind the monk of the need of tending to spiritual perfection, and of the gratuity of justification and grace (this has sometimes been wrongly regarded as Protestant or Quietist teaching).

β) The dialogue *De baptismo* teaches that though the seeds of perfection have been planted in the soul by baptism which effaces sin, this seed (sanctifying grace?) can only produce all its effects by the free operation of those who keep the Commandments.

γ) Means of perseverance and progress treated separately are : 1. the frequent thought of God (*Ad Nicolaum, precepta salutaria*); 2. fasting (*De jejuniis*); 3. penance, consisting less in exterior works than in true and heartfelt contrition (*De penitentia*).

δ) Lastly, two works of a more special nature : *Disputatio cum causidico* and *Consultatio spiritualis cum anima sua* *.

If this work really dates from the beginning of the fifth century, as is generally thought, it is important to note, in addition to its wise asceticism, its fairly exact teaching on grace, and still more the doctrine of original sin, whose effects are dealt with in the *opusculum* which treats of baptism.

IV. ASCETIC TEACHING. BRIEF OUTLINE.

A). The Spiritual Combat.

Only the more characteristic aspects of this teaching will be mentioned here. The spirituality of these monks can be best understood by an examination of their conception of Christian life. This life, to their minds, is primarily a combat. They seem in particular to have meditated, understood and appreciated the words by which Saint Paul exhorts the Ephesians to put on "the armour of God" and the "breastplate of justice", to take the "shield of faith, the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit", in order to "resist the snares of the devil", or the watchword which

* According to Photius, *Cod.* 200.

The *Capitula de temperantia* are not authentic. They consist of sayings taken from Saint Maximus the Confessor and the homilies bearing the name of S. Macarius.

† P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne des origines de l'Eglise au Moyen-Age*, pp. 171-217. See also L. Roure, *Une école de volonté au quatrième siècle, les études*, 1916 (t. 147), p. 453-474, 569-587. *Eph.*, VI, 11-17.

he gave to his disciple, Timothy, and which had been the guiding principle of his own life: *certa bonum certamen fidei*¹; *bonum certamen certavi*². This spirit of valiant spiritual strife, so essential to Christian life, was well maintained in the Church, and an echo of it is found in the writings of the first Fathers³. Nevertheless, it seems to have been present with even greater intensity in the life and the teaching of the first monks, who remain for us the very embodiment of the spiritual combat. The *enemies* with whom they strove were vice and the devil.

Eight vices⁴ were usually numbered as being the source and essence of all evil. They were classified according to the order in which it was most easy to overcome them; three of them regard the body or outward things — *gluttony* in eating and drinking, *impurity* and *avarice*; three others dwell in the sensitive part of the soul: *anger*, *sadness* and *sloth* (or distaste for the spiritual life, *acedia*); the last, which are the most difficult to uproot, are *vain glory*, and *pride*, which is double: first, pride of the flesh, found in beginners or the carnal minded, whom it leads to disobedience, jealousy and fault finding; secondly, spiritual pride, which attacks monks who have made greater progress in the way of perfection, in order to prevent them from reaching complete perfection, or lead them to place too much confidence in their own strength and too little reliance on grace. Such was the fault of the Pelagians.

The monks often laid all their troubles to the charge of the devil, and in this perhaps they went too far⁵. It cannot be denied, however, that the devil often attacked them, either by means of simple *temptations* (acting on the internal senses), or by *obsessions* (acting on the external senses), or by *illusions*. (subtle presentation of evil under the appearance of good)/ The more experienced monks were acquainted with the devil's "tricks" and taught their younger brethren how to ward off his attacks and to recognise them for what they were (by the uneasiness of the soul they caused) and thus to resist them.

¹ *I Tim.*, VI, 12. — *3 II Tim.*, iv, 7.

² See in particular, besides Saint Ignatius, the second Epistle of *Clem.*, p. 77. 1

⁴ See above, the *Antirrheticus* of Evagrius, or the *De octo spiritibus malitis* of Saint Nilus. See also below, Cassian, p. 595, 597.

⁵ It may well be believed that in those days of dying Paganism the **devil's** activity was more frequently and more tenaciously exercised than in our time. 1

B). The Weapons.

Three weapons were particularly recommended to the monk : prayer, work and fasting.

a) Prayer was his first duty. Had he not withdrawn to the desert, far from the world, to be in the very presence of God? In the monasteries, definite rules governed the time for prayer. Saint Pachomius prescribed it in detail for the morning, afternoon and evening of each day. But except for the weekly synaxis, it was left to the initiative of each anchorite, and consisted chiefly in the singing of psalms, to which many of them devoted several hours of the day and night. The monk was counselled to live always with the thought of God present to him, and this was considered by Marcus the Hermit as one of the most powerful means of overcoming the passions¹.

Work was never separated from prayer, and filled all the hours of the day, for the monk had to earn his bread by the work of his hands². No doubt there were sometimes idlers among the solitaries, but by their idleness they were breaking one of the fundamental laws of the spiritual discipline of the desert³.

c) Frugality was held in even greater esteem as a means of subjecting the flesh to the spirit. The manner of fasting, which consisted for the coenobites in taking only one meal a day, was left to the individual fervour of the anchorites, and a great number of them fasted every day : many indeed ended by taking food only every two, three, four, or even five days. The example set by the great ascetics stimulated the least ardent⁴. Although traces of vanity, the desire of taking first place, may have been manifested at times, the solitaries were animated by that spirit of holy emulation which caused Saint Augustine to say : *Et tu non poteris quod isti et istæ s ?*⁵

¹ *td Nicolaum, P. G.*, 65, 1027-1054.

² *I. Ladeuzy, op. cit.*, 294-298.

³ Did *Euchitism* (see above, p. 303) have a monastic origin? This has never been proved. In any case it was certainly a deviation of the monastic spirit and lies as is described by the masters of asceticism.

⁴ In this respect it has been said that Macarius of Alexandria wanted to hold all the records. *Lausiac Hist.*, XVIII.

⁵ *Confess.*, bk. VIII, c. XI, n. 27. There is nothing to lead us to suspect that any but a very few acted from purely human motives.

C) Victories.

Strengthened against the devil and against himself by this excellent spiritual drill, the monk gradually attained that *self-control*, which the ancients characterised by a word borrowed from the Stoics, but which possesses an essentially Christian signification, the ἀπάθεια¹. It may conveniently be called spiritual peace. It consists neither in the philosopher's apathy of the senses nor the indolence of the Quietists. The monks who had gone far in the practice of asceticism not only did not abandon their austerities, or their work, but augmented them in order to obtain the full perfection of their spiritual life.

The *tranquility of soul* they thus acquired allowed them to contemplate² more easily the eternal things they already possessed by hope. Hence the impression of profound joy and spiritual *abundance* we receive from the stories of these splendid souls, who, living in the midst of such terrible desolation and destitution, were yet rich in the things of the spirit. The examples to be found in the *Lausiatic History* are a perfect illustration of this³. Although the marvellous, picturesque and striking details it contains are not all certainly authentic, the psychology it implies is of the greatest value, for it shows us these men intent only on possessing the things of the world to come, and even some among them already possessing them, in a certain measure, in this world.

¹ Evagrius' work on the 'Απάθεια is lost. Enough, however, is said on the subject in the *Lausiatic History*: vm, xxxvm, LXV, etc.

² Origen's teaching on the *gnosis* was greatly appreciated in the desert, especially at Nitria. It was a valuable offset to the somewhat material and anthropomorphic ideas of some of the more ignorant monks, and at the same time was a great aid to theological learning. Unfortunately the master's theology was not always orthodox and was wrongly applied by certain disciples, with the result that have already been mentioned.

³ See also L. ROUVRE [*op. cit.*] or A. d'ALEX, *Les Pères du Désert, Etudes* (t. io8), p. 7-37.

SECOND SECTION.

CHAPTER X.

The Popes'.

1. SAINT DAMASUS' (366-384).

The writings of the Popes, Bishops of the Apostolic See, the centre of Christian unity, have always possessed a capital importance, both as regards the history of doctrine and the history of the Church. This is especially true of their writings in the end of the fourth century, when tendencies to autonomy were beginning to show themselves, perhaps unconsciously, in the patriarchal Sees of the East. As has been said, the great Greek bishops were aware of such tendencies, but the measures they took were often enough insufficient to have any real effect. The Trinitarian question engaged the greater part of their line and energy, entailing as it did a profound study of the scriptures and a forceful upholding of the teaching of tradition. The campaign to preserve the unity of the Church originated chiefly in Rome, where the task was undertaken with great courage and prudence by the Popes.

Saint Damasus intervened more vigorously than any other of his contemporaries. In his zeal, he remained undeterred by the violence and disorder then rife in the Roman Church, incited by the fanatical followers of the Anti-Pope, Ursinus. It was only by requesting the Emperor Valentinian to employ armed force on his behalf that he was able to rid himself of these disturbers of the peace. *His letters, of which a dozen are extant, all of them "synodal letters" 3, deal authoritatively with doctrinal or personal questions. He firmly proclaimed, as Saint Peter's successor, his right of authority over*

¹ Ja it É, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, 1st ed., 1851, Berlin; 2nd ed., 1885, Leipzig. A. Thiel, *Epistola rom. pontificum genuina*, Brunsbergæ, 1868. See also I^{er} 111FOL, *Le Siècle apostolique*, Paris, 1924.

² Edition: P. L., 13, 347-442. Studies: Merenda, in P. L., 13, 111-158. Ilikval, *Damase I^{er}*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 28-36.

³ L., 13, 347-376. The chronology of these letters and the Councils has not yet been determined.

everything and everybody in the whole Church¹. In the question of the *Church of Antioch*, Damasus, after a certain amount of hesitation, decided in favour of Paulinus²; and refti- ed to accede to Basil's request that he should send a dele;- ation of Latin bishops to the East in order to examine thn claims of Meletius. He was perhaps right in thinking that it was Meletius' place, and not his, to make the first overture» Later, at Saint Basil's request he condemned *Apollinaris* ³. In the fourth letter to Paulinus is found a long list of 24 *anathemai* of contemporary heresies ⁴. Lastly, it would appear that the essential parts of the first two chapters of the famous "*Decretum Gelasianum*" ⁵ should also be attributed to him. As chapter V, dealing with the relations of the three patriarchal- of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, it would appear to dalfl from the end of the fifth century ⁶.

In addition to these official documents, Saint Damasti also wrote a treatise (now lost) *On Virginity*⁷, and perhap® a *Liber de vitiis*. He also composed a number of metrical' inscriptions for the catacombs (epigrammata) ⁹. The versili- ication is poor, but they are important from a historical an- doctrinal point of view. Two of his poems in praise of l lie saints and martyrs are still extant; *On David* and *On .Suba*

¹ *Ibid.*, 374. — ² Letters 2 and 3 are addressed to Paulinus.

³ *Epist.* 2 (frag. 2); *Epist.* 7.

⁴ *P. L.*, 13, 358-364. Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, n. 58-82.

⁵ The Decretum of Gelasius comprises five chapters : I. Dogmatic definiilni- II. Canon of the Scriptures; in. Rome and the first two Oriental patriarchal- IV. The doctrinal authorities of the Church : orthodox Councils and Fathers to ■ distinguished from doubtful authors; V. List of the Apocrypha. E. v m Dobschutz (in *Texte u. Unten.*, Leipzig, 1912) has given a critical reconsnull- of the text, but all do not agree with his opinion regarding its origin. He combla that the work was composed by only one author not living in Rome (Italy, l in or Spain) at the beginning of the sixth century. Dom Chapman, on the colili»- maintains that Gelasius was really the author of the Decretum, but madi- noil his work of earlier documents. It would seem that he is right as regard. tfl latter point. It would be letter to attribute the substance of chapters I and II M Saint Damasus. The second chapter (Denzinger-B.. *Enchiridion*, 11, - contains a canon which differs only in a minor detail from the present! ..»>- Chapter I contains (see *ibid.*, n. 83) a number of doctrinal definitions basi'iH numerous biblical quotations, concerning a) the septiform Spirit; b) tin l|M given to Christ; c) the procession of the Holy Ghost : " Non est Patris taiillB modo Spiritus, sed Patris et Filii". Dom Chapman, *On the " Decretum sianum"*, in *Rev. binld.*, 1913, p. 187-207, 315-333. See E. Amann, in jH bibl., 1913, p. 602-608.

⁶ P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique*, p. 146150.

⁷ According to Saint Jerome, *Epist.*, 22, n. 22.

⁸ According to an early manuscript.

⁹ Several quotations in C. Kir ch, *Enchiridionfont, hist.*, n. 521-528. |

Paul Men of letters found in him a great patron, especially Saint Jerome, whose exegetical and Scriptural work he encouraged.

II. THE FIRST DECRETALS OF THE POPES IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

The term Decretals is now given to those pontifical letters possessing a general bearing (unlike the rescripts² addressed to individuals) and written in answer to a definite question (thus differing from decrees and constitutions which are usually ordinances written *motu proprio*)³. The first decretals found in the canonical Collections are those of Pope Siricius, the first successor of Saint Damasus. The authentic letters of earlier Popes⁵, as far as can be judged from what little is extant, possessed as a whole a simple, more cordial and less administrative character, although the tone of authority is present even from the first letter of Saint Clement. The immense development of the business which fell to the Roman Church led to the setting up of a veritable pontifical Curia, while in the correspondence a new "style" was adopted, imitated, it has been said, from that of the Roman Senate and Court. This new kind of literature, which was destined to have such a brilliant future, made its appearance at the end of the fourth century, under the influence of Pope Siricius⁶.

I The others are not authentic; Z⁸. L. (13, 375-414). Better edition, UHM, *Damasus "Epigrammata*, Leipzig, 1895. Study: C. Weyman, *Rev. hist.* >elig., 1896, p. 58-73.

I In the time of Saint Augustine, the word *rescriptum* or *responsum* meant an official response made by the Emperor (or the Pope) to a judicial consultation issued in the *relation*. The rescript had thus the general bearing of a law.

■ r< l'. Batiffol, *Le cathol. de Saint Augustin*, p. 403-405.

■ 'In the canonical collections, however, these may be assimilated to the judicial. A dogmatic decree containing a lengthy explanation of the faith was given the name of *Tome*, and was in the form either of a Papal letter (for instance, the *Tome to Flavian*, 449) or letter from a Council (*Tome to the Antiochians*, the Council of Alexandria, 362).

■ In first is the *Collectio Dionysiana*; P. L., &], 139-316.

H* Mentioned above: p. 55-61, Saint Clement; p. 153, Saint Soter and Saint Iliu; p. 228 and 244, Saint Callixtus; p. 268 sq., Saint Cornelius and Saint Bti : p. 277, Saint Dionysius; p. 330, Saint Julius; p. 333-335, Liberius; Mit. p. 511, Saint Damasus, whose extant letters are all synodal Epistles. Kt l'isz.-Bann., *Enchiridion*.

V It would be a mistake to infer, however, as do certain Protestants, that the notion of pontifical jurisdiction dates from this epoch, although it is true that the exercise of this jurisdiction has since spread considerably. It should be remarked that this development took place at the time when Rome seems to have lost its title of capital, in favour of Constantinople or Milan.

Saint Siricius † (384-399) seems to have been an extreme!}-able and active administrator, although only *six* of his *letters* are extant. The most important, addressed to *Himerius of Tarragona* is an answer to 15 questions put to Damascius by this bishop concerning various matters of ecclesiastical discipline (baptism, marriage, penance, monks, clergy and laity, etc.). The Pope gave a solution to each case and asked that his letter be made known to the neighbouring bishops. This is the first known Decretal. Five others 3 of the same Pope are identical in character, but of a less general nature.

Saint Anastasius I (399-402) was called upon to make a decision in the Origenist controversy. Hence his three letters to Saint Simplicianus, Bishop of Milan and then to his successor, Venerius⁵, and lastly to John of Jerusalem⁷. Impelled by his esteem for Saint Jerome, and chiefly by the request of Theophilus of Alexandria, he condemned Origen (the terms of the condemnation are not extant)⁷, and twice requested the Church of Milan to follow his example in the letters mentioned above (400). In the following year (401), in the letter to John of Jerusalem, he again reprobated Origen's errors, but did not blame Rufinus, the translator except in the case that his work had been written with the purpose of propagating a false doctrine⁸.

III. WRITINGS OF THE FIRST POPES IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

A). Saint Innocent I (409-417).

Before Saint Leo, there was perhaps no Pope who contributed in so great a measure to the practical organisation of

† *P. L.*, 13, 1131-1147.

* *T.*, 13, 1131-1147. See Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, n. 87. Also Jaffé, *op. cit.*, 2nd ed., n. 258, 259, 260, 261, 263.

4 *P. L.*, 20, 73-76, or Hieron., *Epist.* xciv.

5 Edited in 1871 in the *Bibliophile belge*, p. 123-129. See Van den Gillewin on this letter, in *Kev. Hist. Litt. relig.*, 1899, p. 1-12. Text on the orthodoxy of Pope Liberius in Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion*, n. 93. — 6 *P. L.*, 20, 68-73.

7 44 It is probable that only the doctrines regarding the preexistence of the Holy Spirit, the final restoration of the devil, and the manner of the resurrection were condemned, for even after this condemnation we still find that the other doctrines are maintained". J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, 11, p. 336.

8 See F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme*, I, p. 255-262 and II, p. 38-43. This Innocent proves that Anastasius did not die until December 402.

9 Edition: *P. L.*, 20, 467-640 (Dom Constant's ed.). Studies: E. Amal - *Innocent I (saint)*, in *Did. thiol.*, col. 1940-1950. P. Batiffol, *Le apostolique*, p. 312-336.

that Primacy which all the Churches had ascribed to Rome since the earliest times. The 38 letters he has left, reveal him acting with authority both in the East and the West. The majority are of a disciplinary nature. Among these the most famous are the letters : 2 to Victricius of Rouen¹ ; 6 to Exuperius of Toulouse² ; 25 to Decentius of Eugubium³ (Gubbio). In these letters the Pope demands that local ecclesiastical customs, both liturgical and disciplinary, should give way to the customs and uses of the Roman Church, which holds them from the Prince of the Apostles (*Ep.* 25, n. I, 2.). The chief points of interest are the texts⁴ regarding the canon of the Scriptures (*Ep.* 6), the baptism of heretics (recognised as valid if conferred in the name of the Three Persons, *Ep.* 2), reconciliation of the dying (*Ep.* 6), Confirmation (reserved to the bishop) and Extreme Unction (*Ep.* 25).

Special measures were laid down for the Sacrament of Order. Saint Innocent established several irregularities, especially that of successive bigamy, applied even to those whose marriage had been contracted and ended by the death of the other party before baptism⁵. He watched over the strict observance of the laws concerning the continency of the clergy. He forbade clerks who had been ordained heretically to exercise their functions⁶ ; although he uses very forcible terms, it is a mistake to conclude that he denied the validity of ordinations by heretics ; on the contrary, he appears to forbid re-ordination. In another letter⁷, although he supposes that the Arian ordinations suffer from grave defects, he still will not allow them to be re-ordained ; it should be noted, however, that the reasons he gives narrow the application of his decision⁸.

The deposition of Saint John Chrysostom by Theophilus of Alexandria and the Emperor, was not accepted by Innocent. He refused to recognise the usurping bishop and sent an encouraging letter to the Christians who had remained faithful to John (7?/ 7). To the exile himself he wrote several letters, one of which is extant (*Ep.* 12). When his plan for a Council at Thessalonica was brought to nothing by the violence of the Emperor of the East, acting on the advice of the patriarchs, he withdrew himself from communion with the latter, until

¹ *P. L.*, 20, 469-481. — *P. L.*, 20, 495-502. — ³ *P. L.*, 20, 551-561.

⁴ See Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion*, n. 94-99.

Saint Jerome hotly maintained the contrary opinion. *Ep.* 69.

¹ *Epist.* 17, n. 3, to Rufus and the Macedonian bishops.

⁷ *Epist.* 24, to Alexander of Antioch.

⁸ For both these cases see L. Sallet, *Les réordinations*, p. 68-73

John's name had been replaced in the Diptychs. John of course was already dead when this was done, but it repaired in some measure the wrong that had been done to him. Excommunication, the Pope's only weapon in such circumstances, is futile only in appearance; it did not seem to worry Theophilus, who died without being reconciled (412); but it is really efficacious when it affects rightminded souls, sincerely desirous of being fully Christian and consequently united to the Body of Christ.

Saint Cyril, Theophilus' nephew and successor, seemed in no hurry to return to communion with Rome, but he did so eventually. Tin- exact date when he took this step is unknown, but it was probably before 419. Alexander, the new Bishop of Antioch ¹(413) renewed relations with Rome and accepted the conditions imposed on him. Innocent sent him a letter of "peace" (*De pace, Ep.* 19), and later, in hi- answer to certain disciplinary consultations of the same bishop, recognis- ed the privileges of the Church of Antioch, attributing them to the stay that Saint Peter had made in that town before he went to Rome, where he was to finish his work and his life'. Neither could Atticus of Constantinople obtain recognition by Rome until he had fulfilled the necessary conditions for peace³. Moreover, Innocent took the pre- caution of strengthening the position of the Bishop of Thessalonica, whom he made his vicar (a kind of delegated patriarch)⁴ for the whole of Illyricum (the Balkan provinces).

Innocent added to his qualities as an administrator those of a man of doctrine. A few weeks before he died he had to decide on the Pelagian question, in answer to three letters I from the African Church. In reply he also sent three letters, approving the condemnation of Pelagius and Coelestius oit doctrinal grounds, but making certain reservations with regard to their persons⁶7 The bishops had appealed to th- doctrinal authority of Peter. Innocent, who more than anj other was aware of his obligations in this connection, grasped the opportunity of again affirming the privileges of the Apn stolic See of Peter, "a quo seipso episcopatus et tota aucto- ritas nominis huius emersit" (*Epist.* 29)⁷. In Africa ilio Pope's answer was taken as definite, and Saint Augustine cried from the pulpit : *Causa finita est*.

¹ Flavian died in 404. Porphyrios, his successor, a friend of the usurpil Bishop of Constantinople, never succeeded in entering into communion W0 Rome. Pa11. *Dial.*, 16.

a P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 326-332. — ³ *Ibid.*, p. 332-333.

⁴ *Epist.* 13, 17, 18. This vicariate did not exist in name before Bonific- Siricius had already thought of it, but it was left to Innocent I to put the [4] into execution.

⁵ Letters from the Councils of Carthage and Milevis and from five lhMm (Aurelius, Primate of Africa, Saint Augustine and three others). *Epist.*, 28. i 28. /< Z., 20. 564-582. — ⁶ *Epist.* 29, 30, 31. P. L., 20, 582-597.

⁷ In Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion*, 100. See P. Βαττιή il Pope Innocent's answer, *Le Catholicisme de S. Augustin*, p. 393-401«

B). The successors of Pope Innocent I. These Popes have also left letters of great interest from a *doctrinal* and *disciplinary* point of view.

1. Of the correspondence of Saint Zosimus (417-418) 14 letters are extant¹, but the most famous of all his letters, the *Epistola Tractoria* is lost²; it contained the final approval of the dogmatic canons of the General Council of Carthage (418) concerning original sin and grace s.

2. Saint Boniface I (418-422) hardly refers to the Pelagian question in his correspondence³, but the constitution of the Vicariate of Thessalonica⁴ and the firm affirmation of the Primacy and Infallibility of the Apostolic See should be noted⁵.

3. Saint Celestine I (422-432). The correspondence⁶ of this Pope is chiefly concerned with the Christological controversy arising out of the Nestorian heresy⁷. Nevertheless he was obliged to keep himself in touch with, and direct the controversy against, the Pelagians. He approved their fresh condemnation by the Council of Ephesus. With great tact, he indicated to the Bishop of Gaul what measure of authority should be given to Saint Augustine's writings on the doctrine of grace (*Epist.* 29)⁸. (A document which has since been embodied in this letter, and which was perhaps written by the future Pope, Saint Leo, at this time, confirmed the measures taken by the Pope by means of quotations from earlier Popes and Councils ".) Like his predecessors, Saint Celestine insisted on the authority of the Apostolic See, especially on the occasion of the Council of Ephesus (413) which bore striking witness to it, as did also the Council of Chalcedon in the time of Saint Leo⁹.

¹ The collection comprises 16, but two of these are not his. *P. L.*, 20, 642-685.

Except for fragments: *P. L.*, 20, 693-695, according to S. Augustine (*Epist.* 100, n. 23), S. Celestine (*Epist.* 21, n. 9-11) and S. Prosper (*Adv. Coll.*, v, 3).

² Mansi, *Conc. Coll.*, in, 811 sq. See Denzinger-B., *Enchiridion*, 101-108.

³ Comprising 15 letters, 9 of which are Boniface's. *P. L.* 20, 750-783.

Epist., 13, 14, 15. On the theory of the *three patriarchates* here mentioned,

✓ p. 305.

Ibid., 2. See also Zosimus, *Epist.* 12.

Numbering 25 letters, of which 16 are Celestine's. *P. L.*, 50, 417-557.

This is dealt with in Book in. — 9 *P. L.*, 50, 528-537.

Ibid., col. 531-535. Also in Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, n. 129-142. For the

¹ *tula*, see E. Portai, *Île, Cilestin I (saint)*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 2052-2061.

² Batiffol, *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin*, p. 532-534.

³ The lawfulness of the appeal to Rome was not contested. A certain Antonini, one of the disciples of St. Augustine, who had made him *Bishop of Bussala* later interdicted him on account of his oppressive rule, appealed to Rome and « i. on the point of being reinstated by Boniface I, who had been misled by false thli.rination, when Saint Augustine obtained from St. Celestine a reversal of this filling. The right of appeal was admitted in principle, but in Africa there was n) ire (Coun. Carth., 393) to prevent its use by priests and clerks. Rome, however, held out against this restriction, and in 418 Zosimus received the appeal Hl *Apiarius*, a priest of Sicca, who had been deposed by Urbanus and was one of 'i i Augustine's best disciples. Before long, however, he was again deposed (nr other irregularities. Nevertheless St. Celestine was about to reinstate him m>rw when he was constrained to confess his crimes in a synod in presence of the

CHAPTER XL

Saint Ambrose.

Special Bibliography.

1. Editions: *P. L.*, 14-17. For the exegetical works, see also *Corpus* of Vienna, t. XXXII, f. I, II (1897) and IV (1912, *In Luc.*, t. LXII (1919, *In Psalm.*).

2. Studies: A. Baunard, *Histoire de S. Ambroise*, Paris, 1871 (interesting work from a literary point of view). A. DE Broglie, *Saint Ambroise* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1899 (deals chiefly with the Saint's political activity); *II Eglise et l'empire romain*, t. vi (the entire volume). Th. Foerster, *Ambrosius, Bischof von Mailand*, Halle, 1884. P. de Labriolle, *S. Ambroise* (Coll. *Pensée chrét.* Paris, 1908; *Hist. litt. lat. chrét.* p. 351-382. R. Thamin, *S. Ambroise et la morale chrétienne au IV^e siècle*, Paris, 1895. P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, p. 20-82. Doctrinal monographies in German: J. B. Kellener (on the exegesis of the Old Test.), Regensburg, 1893; J. E. Niederhuber (on the Kingdom of God), Mainz, 1904; (on the eschatology), Paderborn, 1907. A. Largent, *Ambroise (saint)*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 942-951. P. DE Labriolle, *Ambroise (saint)*, in *Did. hist.*, col. 1091-1108.

I. LIFE OF SAINT AMBROSE. POLITICAL INFLUENCE.

A). Before the Episcopate.

Saint Ambrose was born, probably at Trier, between 330 and 340; the most likely date is 333. His father, also named Ambrose, was Praetorian Prefect for Gaul; he was a Christian and one of the most highly placed officers of the Empire. He died young, leaving three children, Mantellina, Satyrius and Ambrose. After their father's death, they were taken to Rome by their mother in order to finish their education.

legate. Apart from the fact of the baseness of this priest, and the way his call was studied at Rome, there remains no doubt that the Popes had both the right and the duty of acting as they did: it was their duty to defend the *principi*. "I the lawfulness of the appeal to the Apostolic See for all, and this right was eventually admitted everywhere. See P. Batiffol on the above incidents, *op. cit.* 77J 442-472. A. AUDOLLENT, *Antoninus and Apiarius*, in *Did. hist.*, col. 872-871 and 951-954.

■ The principal sources for Saint Ambrose's life are, in addition to the details furnished by contemporary Fathers: a) His correspondence (see below); b) till *Pita Ambrosii*, written about 420 by his secretary, the deacon Paulinus, at Salm Augustine's request, *P. L.*, 14, 27-46. This work is primarily meant for piety edification, but is also valuable from a historical aspect.

Marcellina received the virgin's veil from the hands of Pope Liberius in 353, and later helped her brother, Ambrose, in his labours. Satyrus died in 377-378, and on this occasion Ambrose preached two famous funeral orations. After finishing his extremely sound literary education, Ambrose studied law, practised for some time, and then while he was still young, about 370, entered on an administrative career, in which he was sponsored by a powerful patron, the Praetorian Prefect of Italy. Shortly afterwards, in 373, he was made Governor of Liguria and Emilia, with consular rank and residence at Milan. He had occupied this post for about a year when Auxentius died, and the people clamoured for him to be made their bishop. This choice having been approved by the bishops and the Emperor himself, he was obliged to yield. Although he had been brought up a Christian, he was still a catechumen. He was therefore baptised immediately, and received Holy Orders, a few days later, on December 7, 374.

B). The Episcopate: pastoral activity.

Ambrose's first care on taking possession of his episcopal See was to rid himself of his great wealth and to give it to the poor. Later he had no less hesitation in selling the sacred vessels of his church in order to ransom captives. He was at the service of all, without distinction of class; anyone could approach him, says Saint Augustine², unless the crowd of the poor and miserable which surrounded him became so great that no one could pass. Paulinus³ also tells us that he was kindness itself, adapting himself to everyone, and unbending especially to poor sinners whom he had won by his tears.

Ambrose possessed the happy gift of being able to reach his hearers through his preaching. He was a magnificent orator; in his style, the always evident firmness of the Roman magistrature is tempered by that suavity which so charmed Saint Augustine before his conversion : *verbis ejus suspende-*

¹ Paulinus describes the incident of his election [*op. at.*, 6]; while Ambrose was endeavouring to keep order among the crowd of Christians, both Catholic and Arian, gathered together in the basilica and engaged in heated discussion, a child's voice was heard to cry : *Ambrose bishop!* It came as a kind of inspiration. He was chosen immediately by the people, with one voice.

² *Conf* bk. VI, 3.

³ *lita Ambrosii*, 39.

bar intentus... et delectabar suavitate sermonis\ Ambrose went for his eloquence, not to his classical learning, but to the Scriptures and the Fathers. The first thing he did on being raised so unexpectedly to the episcopacy was to begin a close study of the sacred sciences, with which till then he had but a nodding acquaintance. He chose the priest Simplicianus, his future successor, as his director in these studies. In exegesis he followed Origen and even Philo, while in theology the *masters he preferred* were Saint Athanasius and Didymus, Saint Cyril of Jerusalem and Saint Gregory Nazianzen, with the Western writer, Hippolytus, who had also written and thought in Greek. In spite of these Oriental influences, Ambrose always remained a true writer of the Latin school, both in his style and in his ideas; his teaching was before all things *practical*, more catechetical in nature than speculative; his constant personal treatment of ideas is explained by his early education and the daily needs of his flock. The *subjects* upon which Saint Ambrose preached are known both from his exegetical works which contain a synopsis of them, and from his treatises, which more often than not consist of revised sermons published in book form. The Bishop cared little about making a name for himself as an author, content if he was able to edify and do good by his writings. His choice of subjects and the manner he treats them make this evident.

Although Arianism had lost much ground in the West since 361, Milan still remained one of its strongholds, thanks to Auxentius, a native of Cappadocia, who, having been established in the See by Constantius in 355, had been successful in remaining there, supported as he was by Valentinian I, in spite of Saint Hilary's opposition, and later that of Pope Damasus. Ambrose set himself to destroying what remained of the heresy in his two great treatises dedicated to Gratian, *On Faith* (before 380) and *On the Holy Ghost* (381). Later, as will be seen, he was adamant in his resistance to the Empress Justina who protected the heretics. As for the people, he turned to his own uses the very arms forged by the Arians, and composed religious *hymns* for them to sing

¹ *Conf.* V, 13. It was due to these words that Augustine gradually lost touch with Manichaeism. *Ibid.* 14. If we can judge by the *Vita* (17), Arians also were won over, for Paulinus narrates how an Arian one day perceived an angel dictating to Ambrose the sermon he was about to preach from the pulpit.

flourishing the ceremonies. This move met with so great success that the Arians accused the Bishop of deceiving the people by his enchanting hymns, while he himself freely avowed the efficacy of this "confession" of the Trinity by the mouth of a whole people.

Saint Ambrose's liturgical innovations² seem to have gone further than that. The Milanese or Ambrosian rite is indebted to him for other additions. Like the Gallican or Spanish (Mozarabic) rite, this rite appears to certain historians as being derived from the primitive Roman rite. At the present time, however, there is a tendency to recognise their Oriental character and to place the beginning of their more ample development in the middle of the fourth century or after. It is supposed that it was by way of Milan that Gaul and Spain felt the influence of Oriental liturgy. Mgr Duchesne even thinks he is justified in saying that it was Auxentius who played a leading part in procuring this transformation³. P. Lejay⁴ finds this opinion extremely probable and adds: "When Saint Ambrose succeeded Auxentius he must have retained the greater part of the latter's already old innovations, and contented himself with correcting certain expressions and ensuring the orthodoxy of the whole. Whether he did no more than correct, or whether his influence was more profound than that, as is very possible, it was Saint Ambrose who gave his name to the Milanese rite, which in the course of time has changed continually, owing to Roman influence and the exigencies of Christian life.

C) Episcopacy. Political influence.

Ambrose's political activity was very great; it put on various forms, under *Gratian* (375-383), under the regency when the power was in the hands of *Justina* (383-388) in the name of her son, *Valentinian* 72 (375-392), and under *Theodosius* (379-395) who, from 388, after the defeat and death of *Maximus* (383-388), governed the whole of the Empire.

¹ Grande carmen istud est, quo nihil potentius. Quid enim potentius quam confitessio Trinitatis, quae quotidie totius populi ore celebratur? *Contra Aux.*, 34. *P. Z.*, 16, 1017.

² P. Lejay, *Ambrosien (rite)* in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 1373-1442. See in particular *P. Z.*, 16, 1017.

³ *Origines du culte chrétien*, 3rd ed., p. 86 sq., and in *Revue d'hist. et de litt. eccl.*, 1900 (t. V), p. 31 sq. See also G. MERCATI, Rome, 1902.

⁴ P. Lejay, *op. cit.*, col. 1380.

1. Ambrose was the confidant of the young Gratian, who abandoned Trier in favour of Milan, probably in order to benefit by the Bishop's advice. "Gratian brought with him to Milan all the anxiety of his inexperienced youth and his timorous conscience. Ambrose, on account of the many offices he had filled in his time, was able to combine well tried political capabilities with his priestly authority... Soon, therefore, the Emperor and the Bishop became close friends;... the Imperial palace was open to Ambrose... The conduct of the young prince, which till then had been weak and vacillating, became firm and unhesitating, as is proved by his more important legislative acts. The influence of Ambrose, however, was especially evident in several measures of a religious nature, of which the purpose was to free the Church from the cramping prescriptions which still hindered her expansion, and to abrogate the official laws which still bore traces of idolatry"¹. The chief of these measures were the suppression of revenues, subventions and the immunity, which until then had been granted to the colleges of Pagan priests and to the vestals, and the order to take away from the Curia (the Senate House at Rome) the statue of the goddess of Victory, which received special veneration from those Senators who were still Pagan.

2. Gratian was assassinated in Gaul where he had gone to put down a rising in 383. The power was seized by Maximus to the prejudice of Valentinian II, who was still a child, but who had been given a share in the Empire by Gratian. *Justina*, his mother, immediately hastened from Sirmium, where she had been living with the young prince, and begged Ambrose's support in order to obtain that Maximus should at least consent to share the power with Valentinian II^a. During the winter of 383-384, Ambrose went to Trier and by means of skilful procrastination gained time for Justina to fortify the line of the Alps and thus retain Italy for her son, at least for a certain time. Meanwhile, during Ambrose's absence, a serious situation had arisen in Rome. Taking advantage of the change of power, the Pagans endeavoured to obtain from the new Emperor the re-establishment of the Altar of Victory in the Curia; the Prefect Symmachus was their spokesman and pleaded so cleverly and so eloquently that it seemed impossible for the Court to refuse his request. Fortunately Ambrose came back in time. Having been told of Symmachus' petition, "he immediately composed an eloquent refutation", of which the forceful irony soon showed up the

¹De Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 37-39. See also P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 23-24.

^a*Ibid.*, 64-70.

3 Letters to Valentinian II, 17 and chiefly 18; *P. L.*, 16, 961-982.

hallow cleverness of the Latin rhetor"'. When it came to making the final decision, the Emperor gave in to Ambrose.

Ambrose was soon faced with an even more unexpected danger²⁴. Justina, who was at heart an Arian and who had surrounded herself with Arians, mostly of Gothic origin whom she had brought with her from Sirmium to Milan, demanded that the *Portian Basilica*, situated at the gates of the town, should be handed over to her protégés. Saint Ambrose refused, politely but definitely. A month later, about Easter 385, another attempt was made to wrest a basilica from him by force; this was the *New Basilica* in the heart of the town. A riot broke out and the troops retreated. A fresh attempt took place in the Springtime of 386: Ambrose was requested to yield the churches and to leave the town himself. A rival had been found for him in the person of Mercurinus, also called Auxentius, who was a native of Scythia and a declared Arian. Fearing an attack during the Easter festival, Ambrose shut himself up in the Portian Basilica, together with a crowd of his faithful followers, and prepared for a siege. But the Court feared to resort to force. The Bishop and his willing defenders employed their enforced leisure in singing hymns³. It was then that he preached his famous discourse *Contra Auxentium*, in which he did not flinch from saying: *Imperator intra Ecclesiam et non supra Ecclesiam est*. The popularity which accrued to Ambrose from the finding of the remains of Saints Gervasius and Protasius, and their translation which was marked by miracles, finally obliged the Emperor to abandon his plans⁵.

Justina was reconciled with Ambrose in the following year (387) and again sent him on a diplomatic mission to Maximus⁶. The usurper set himself up as a protector of the Catholics and displayed an exaggerated zealotness (execution of the heretic, Priscillian, in Spain, threats to Justina in Italy). Ambrose saw through his hypocrisy and thought it expedient to intimidate him by speaking firmly and frankly. This attitude was not approved by the Court of Milan, which sent in his place a more supple emissary. The latter's sly diplomacy, however, showed up only too well the chinks in the armour of Valentinian II.

¹ A. de Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 74. See *ibid.*, 74-77.

² F. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 70-95.

³ See August., *Conf.*, ix, c. vn, 15; *P. L.*, 32, 770.

⁴ See below, the Doctrine of Saint Ambrose.

See August., *Conf.*, ix, c. vn, 16. *Ibid.*

⁵ P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, 95-109. De Broglie, *op. cit.*, p. 104-114.

Maximus retorted by at once invading Italy (387). The following year he was defeated by Theodosius at Aquileia (388) and Valentinian, who together with his mother had fled to Theodosius for protection, was reinstated. Shortly afterwards Justina died, and the young Emperor found a counsellor and a father in Ambrose. Henceforth Theodosius himself continued to keep a watchful eye on Western affairs.

3. Saint Ambrose's relations with Theodosius were just as friendly as those he had enjoyed with the other princes, and he was able to influence him in an equal degree. On principle, the Emperor and the Bishop were agreed as to the place the Church should occupy in a Christian State, Sometimes, however, Theodosius was liable to forget this: Ambrose was courageous enough to remind him of his duties, and after one or two critical incidents made himself heard. *Two clashes* between the Emperor and the Bishop are especially worthy of notice.

In 388 at Callinicum (Syria, near the Euphrates), the Christians had set fire to the Jewish synagogue, and, according to the official report, had been supported by their Bishop. Theodosius ordered that the guilty prelate should rebuild the synagogue at his own cost. Ambrose protested in a letter¹, in the name of Christian principles, and showed that although such a decision might not be absolutely unjust it was not at all expedient. Some time after, he challenged the Emperor from the pulpit and would not begin Mass until this punishment had been lifted².

In 390, a number of Imperial officers having been killed in a revolt in Thessalonica, Theodosius commanded reprisals, in the course of which several thousand men met their death. Saint Ambrose withdrew from Milan, and wrote to the Emperor, reproaching him with this crime and exhorting him to do penance³; under pain of excommunication; a threat which had not been employed since the Empire became Christian⁴. An extraordinary impression was created when the prince was seen to submit "to ecclesiastical discipline and do penance"⁵, publicly prostrate before the congregation of the faithful who were praying for him, and who were "nearer to tears at seeing the abasement of the Imperial Majesty than fearing to irritate him by any fault"⁶. Even if Ambrose did not stop Theodosius at the door of the church, and even if the Emperor did not let eight months pass before submitting, yet,

¹ Letter 40, translated by P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, 109-125. See also letter 41.

² It was no doubt too much to allow the delinquents to escape scot-free, but to Ambrose's mind it was far graver still to oblige a bishop to raise a temple for the purpose of non-Christian worship.

³ Letter 51, translated *ibid.*, p. 127-136.

⁴ P. Batiffol, *Le Siège apostolique*, p. 73-76. Even Saint Basil did not refuse communion to Valens. Greg. Naz., *Orat.*, 43, n. 52-53.

⁵ S. Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, V, c. 26; *I. L.*, 41, 173.

⁶ *Ibid.*

as Theodoret says', "Ambrose personified in this circumstance not only the Catholic Church, but the conscience of humanity". His greatness was never seen to greater advantage.

The Bishop of Milan's last great discourses are devoted to the two Emperors. In 392 he was saddened by the death of his young protégé, *Valentinian II*, who, at the age of 20, was assassinated in Gaul at the orders of Arbogast, while Ambrose himself was hurrying to join him in order to baptise him and help him in outmanoeuvring his enemies. It was with a depth of real feeling that he preached his funeral sermon. In this sermon he bore valuable witness to the baptism of desire : *si martyres suo abluuntur sanguine et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas* 3. The Emperor Eugenius, who was not at all averse to the restoration of Paganism, received but a cold welcome from Ambrose, who soon afterwards (394) was able to applaud the triumph of *Theodosius*. But only four months later the great Emperor also died (395) and Ambrose had again to preach a funeral oration. Two years later, in 397, Ambrose himself died. The great esteem and authority he had enjoyed during his lifetime grew even greater after his death. He is one of the most illustrious sons of the Church and posterity will always think of him as the *great Bishop of Milan*.

D) Character.

If Saint Ambrose would be well understood he must not be considered apart from the historical circumstances and atmosphere in which he passed his life. Only an incomplete portrait of the great bishop can be derived from his works, his true character will be seen in a true light only by an examination of the facts we have mentioned above. "On the historical background of those troubled times his person gradually emerges with all its manly charm. Although he himself went to the Greeks for his learning, both his character

¹ Certain trustworthy authors regard Theodoret's account (*Hist. Eccl.*, V, 17) as being only an amplification of the details found in Saint Ambrose's letter, 'Inlinus' narrative (*Vita*, 24) and Saint Augustine's *City of God*. Many doubtful details seem to point to the fictitious nature of the whole story. See P. DE LAET, *op. cit.*, p. 136-144. Other reputed historians, however, find answers to these objections : thus, de Brogue, in the *Correspondant*, August 25, 1900. The contrary thesis is maintained by Van Ortoy, S. J., Bollandist, in *Ambrosiana*, 1897, and in *Analecta Bollandiana*, 1904, p. 418 sq.

• R. Tuamin, *op. cit.*, p. 33, together with Mgr Baunard, favours the veracity of Theodoret's account.

² *De obitu Valent.*, 51-53. *P. L.*, 16, 1374-1375-

and his conduct were for ever stamped with the mark of Rome. His iron will, his pertinacity in carrying out his plans, his sense of discipline, his practical turn of mind were all gifts of his Roman nature, and in Ambrose they reached the highest degree of force and brilliance”¹.

Saint Ambrose was pre-eminently a bishop, a pastor of souls, gracious and mild, a strong and vigilant administrator blessed with rare common sense. At the same time he was a model of the Christian statesman, giving his advice without violence as without weakness; his policy did not go beyond aiming at the official and permanent sanction of a new state of things, consequent on the actual conversion of the greater part of the Empire to Christianity. He combined with his passionate love of all things Roman an acute perception of the *rights of the Church*; he imposed them, not hesitating in regarding them as a generally admitted principle². He was convinced moreover that society could have no better mainstay than these rights. He was the first striking example of “the great part that the Christian episcopacy was to play in a world which had been shattered and renewed, and for which, although he did not foresee it, he helped to pave the way”³. He was pre-eminently a *Doctor of the Church*.

II. WORKS.

The works of Saint Ambrose are chiefly concerned with the *Holy Scriptures* and *moral theology*; a few also deal with *dogmatic questions*; and lastly, there exists a number of miscellaneous writings.

A). Scriptural Works.

The majority of these are *sermons*, rapidly revised by the Bishop before publication. Furthermore, all these writings, with the exception of one dealing with Saint Luke, tie in with the *Old Testament*, to which the author usually went the burden of his teaching. Taken as a whole, these writings cannot be said to be commentaries in the usual sense of the word, but are rather *treatises* on some subject containing

¹ P. de Labriolle, *Op. cit.*, p. 28.

² Any other procedure would have been a sign of weakness on his part, and in practice, there was nothing that could justify a different attitude.

³ Due de Brogue, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

in the Scriptures. Moreover, they were written more for the purpose of edifying the faithful than as purely scholarly criticisms. For all these reasons Saint Ambrose's work possesses real unity, and since, on the other hand, it is fairly extensive and not lacking in originality, in spite of his constant reference to earlier commentators, it is easy to understand the great reputation he acquired as an exegetist in the fourth century.

By following the Biblical order i, six classes of writings may be distinguished in Ambrose's works.

1. The *Hexaameron*², in six books³, is a study of the work of the six day of Creation, imitated from Saint Basil. The author charmingly describes the various appearances of the earth, and when need be, discusses the scientific theories of the period. In the latter, he usually found an opportunity of rising to the contemplation of God; hence the tendency to symbolism, which was so appreciated in his works in the Middle Ages, although for the most part it is only based on fabulous natural history, such as that of Aelianus or of Pliny. But Ambrose only cared for the moral lesson, and no one could draw it out better than he; the poetic dress in which he is pleased to clothe it, in no wise lessens its efficacy⁴.

2. The first chapters of Genesis again furnished Saint Ambrose with matter for three treatises : a) *De paradiso*; b) *De Cain et Abel* (in two books); c) *De Noe et Arcas*; all of which seem to be the Bishop's first attempts at commenting the Scriptures (375-378).

3. The early Patriarchs interested him especially, as witness the two books of the treatise *De Abraham** the two treatises dealing with Isaac (*De Isaac et anima* and *De bono mortis*)¹, and above all the four books which treat of the story of Jacob⁸: a) *De tuga seculi*; b) *De Jacob et vita beata* (two books); c) *De Joseph patriarcha*; d) *De benedictionibus patriarcharum* (in two books). The various editors have rightly classed

† This is the order in which the treatises are found in *P. L.*, 14-15.

• *P. L.*, 14, 123-274.

† There are nine sermons preached on six successive days; the 1st, 3rd and 5th books each contain two sermons. With the exception of a few passages, the oratorical style has been suppressed.

* See a number of extracts in P. de Labriolle, *Saint Ambrose*, p. 193-203.

L., 14, a) 275-314; b) 315-360; c) 361-416. The number of books will only be given when several are contained in a treatise. The majority have only one.

■ *P. L.*, 14, 419-500.

† *P. L.*, 14, Sot-534 and 539-568.

∠ *L.*, 14, a) 569-596; b) 597-638; d) 641-672; f) 675-696.

the *Defuga speculi* among Ambrose's moral works ; it may also, however, be classed with his exegetical works, since the latter are more spiritual and moral than they are critical in nature.

4. After the period of the patriarchs he devoted studies to the following Biblical figures': a) Elias (*De Elia jejunio*); b) Naboth (*De Nabuthe Jesraelita*); c) Tobias (*De Tobia*); d) Job and David (*De interpellatione Job et David*, four books on the real physical and moral ills from which mankind suffers); e) David again in *Apologia prophétie David*

5. Ambrose found matter for two series of sermons in the Psalms: a) the first comprises 12 sermons (*Enarrationes*)³ on Psalms i, 35-48 (with the exception of 41, 42, 44 and 46) and 61. Although a fine preface in Saint Basil's manner precedes the first of these instructions, they were not composed in their present order, but owe this arrangement to the editors; b) the second series is an *Exposition* in 22 sermons⁴ of Psalm 118, containing 22 sections or strophes according to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. It was the author's aim therein to explain to Christians the means of attaining perfection; in order to discover them and teach them he pressed into his service all the gifts of his mystical soul and the resources of his burning eloquence.

Note. — Ambrose's short commentary on Isaiás (*Expositio Isaia propheta*) is lost, save for a number of quotations found in Saint Augustine. The *Commentary on the Canticle of Canticles*, which bears his name, was compiled in the twelfth century from extracts from his works.

6. The commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke (*Expositio Evangelii sec. Lucam*)⁵ in ten books, his longest work, is the only exegetical writing he devoted to the New Testament. Book II is a revision of Eusebius of Caesarea's *Questions on the Gospels*; but even here, Ambrose's method of establishing a harmony of the various Gospel narratives is more moral than critical. The other books, which consist

¹ P. L., 14, «) 697-728; 4) 731-756; d) 759-794: d)

^{*} P. L., 14, 851-884. This was preached at Milan shortly after the assassination of Gratian, while Theodosius was absent. Ambrose could nevertheless dedicate the work to the Emperor at a later date, and this would explain the superscription of several early manuscripts: *Ad Theodosium Augustum*. The other *Apology of David*, attributed to Ambrose (P. L., 14, 887-916) is not authentic.

³ P. L., 14, 921-1180.

⁴ P. L., 15, 1197-1526.

⁵ P. L., 15, 1851-1962.

⁴ P. L., 15, 1527-1850.

entirely of a reproduction of his homilies, reveal in an even greater measure his pastoral and moral aim

B). Moral Works.

Although the greater part of the foregoing works are moral writings, it is usual to class more especially under this head a general moral treatise composed for the clergy, the *De officiis*, and various ascetic treatises written for widows and virgins.

i. The *De officiis ministrorum*², written about 391, is a Christian version of Cicero's *De officiis*. Like his model, the author treats of what is right and honest (book I), of what is useful (book II) and of the opposition of these two in (book III). This similarity between the two works makes it easy to compare the morality of the Pagan philosophers with that of the Christians; the exact conception of a last end, certainty of future life and its consequence and the contempt for worldly things, gives to Ambrose's teaching an uncontested superiority. The Pagan examples of Cicero's work are replaced by examples drawn from the Bible. Although this book was meant more particularly for the clergy, Ambrose also hoped that it would serve as an exact manual of moral teaching for all the faithful. It has been supposed that the unity of the work has suffered from this double purpose. In our opinion, however, this real lack of unity is due to the fact that the author, by keeping to the order of Cicero's work, found it impossible to give to those *principal truths*, which distinguish the Christian from the Pagan morality, the true place they should occupy and the importance they merit, in such a work. But, on the other hand, he develops his ideas not so much by means of theoretical and speculative arguments as by means of Scriptural authority, the examples of the saints, and wise and fitting

¹ The chronology of Ambrose's Scriptural works is only approximately exact, and still presents considerable difficulties. The following are the principal dates determined by P. de Labriolle, according to Rauschen (*Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche*, 1897) and Schanz (*Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 1904): a) the books on the *Paradise*, on *Cain* and on *Noe*, 375-378; b) *Apology* of *David*, between 383 and 386 or 387; c) *Exposition of Saint Luke*, 386-388; d) on *Elias*, after 386; e) on *Psalms 118*, after 387; f) *Hexameron*, after 388; g) the majority of the other treatises are posterior to 388.

² P. L., 16, 25-184.

³ He followed this plan the better to show the defects of even the best Pagan morality, as found in Cicero's work. Moreover, it may be surmised that he found Cicero's method perfectly adequate, since he also was more of a statesman than a philosopher.

advice. The defects we have mentioned are more than counterbalanced by these latter qualities, and the work is one of the finest of all Ambrose's writings L

2. The ascetic treatises deal with virginity or continence. This is one of the subjects on which Saint Ambrose was the most eloquent, and it has earned for him the title of "Doctor of Virginity". He devoted no less than five writings to this subject².

a) The *De virginibus* (377), in three books, dedicated to his sister, Mantellina, drew from Saint Jerome the following praise: "In this work Ambrose has opened his heart so eloquently that he has left nothing more than the panegyrists of virginity can say³. To his eulogy of this virtue (bk. I) the Bishop adds prudent and wise advice on the way to practise it (bks. II, III).

i) The *De virginitate*, written shortly after the foregoing (378), is an answer to the objections arising out of the first writing, and completes it.

c) The *De institutione virginis et sanctæ Mariæ virginitate perpetua* dates from the last years of his life (392): it was composed on the occasion of the taking of the veil by the virgin Ambrosia, a kinswoman of Eusebius, Bishop of Bologna, who had given her into the charge of Saint Ambrose. In this book the author refutes Bonosus \ but chiefly holds up Our Lady as a model to all virginss.

rf) The *Exhortatio virginitatis* (393) is a discourse preached at Florence on the occasion of the dedication of a church, built by a wealthy lady, Juliana, who had given all her family to the service of God: Ambrose remarked on this fine example.

e) The *De viduis* (377) forms a complement to the *De -virginibus*. Ambrose declares that the married state is good, but although he does not forbid it he advises widows not to marry again: "neque enim prohibemus secundas nuptias, sed non suademus"⁶.

The *De lapsu virginis consecrat*» was not composed by Saint Ambrose, and should probably be attributed to Nicetas of Remesiana. I

¹ See below, the doctrine of this work, p. 540-542.

³ *P. L.*, 16, a) 187-232; b) 265-302; r) 305-334; d) 335-364; e) 233-262. I

³ *Epist.* 22, n. 23. With affectionate admiration he called Ambrose "Ambrosius noster". Later he changed his tone.

Bonosus, Bishop of Sardica at the end of the fourth century, supposed that Mary had had other children besides Our Lord. He was denounced to the Council of Capua (391-392) and shortly afterwards condemned by a local Council of Thessalonica and by Pope Siricius (*Ep.* IX; *P. L.*, 12, 1176, or among Saint Ambrose's letters, *P. L.*, 16, 1172-1174). Saint Ambrose, who had tried to persuade Bonosus to submit (*Siric.*, *Ep.*, IX, 2), refuted him directly in the above writing. But Bonosus refused to yield and founded a sect which is sometimes confused with that of the Photinians or the Arians on account of other Christological errors into which it fell. See X. Le Bachelier, *Bonose*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 1027-1031.

⁵ See below, p. 543-

⁶ *De viduis*, xi, 68.

C) Dogmatic Works.

Saint Ambrose treated of dogmatic subjects much less than of moral questions. Nevertheless in the course of his ministry he was led to combat Arianism and expand the doctrine of the Sacraments.

1. He wrote three treatises against Arianism

a) The *De fide* (378-380), dedicated to Gratian who had requested it to be written, comprises five books : the first two (378) are an outline of the subject ; the following three (380) deal with the *Divinity of the Word* in greater detail.

b) The *De Spiritu Sancto* (381), also dedicated to Gratian, is a complement to the preceding work and deals with the Third Person : Ambrose shows that like the Son, the Holy Ghost is consubstantial with the Father, that He is, in other words, God. In reality, the work is but a revision of Didymus' work¹, helped out by Saints Athanasius and Basil.

c) The *De incarnationis dominicæ sacramento* (381-382) is also a refutation of Arianism occasioned by objections which were raised by two officers at the Court in the time of Gratian.

2. Saint Ambrose has left but two treatises on the Sacraments, which although brief are extremely important.

a) The *De mysteriis* § (387) is a kind of mystagogical catechesis, similar to those of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, which Ambrose had taken as a model. Here he speaks of the three Sacraments of Christian initiation. The authenticity of this work is no longer in doubt. On the contrary, the *De Sacramentis* * is now almost universally regarded as not authentic ; this work, in six books, was compiled by an unknown author, probably in the fourth century, who borrowed extensively from the " *De mysteriis* " and the " *De institutione virginis* ", as well as from Origen's " *De oratione* " and other Greek sources ; it has real worth.

b) The *De pænitentias* (about 384) is a refutation of Novatianism, and is of capital interest as regards the doctrine and the practice of penance in the fourth century.

¹ *J. L.*, 16, a) 527-698; i) 703-816; r) 817-846.

² This treatise was severely criticised by Saint Jerome, who purposely gave a literal translation of Didymus' work : " I preferred to translate another's work than to take example from certain persons and like a misshapen crow bedeck myself in borrowed plumage... " (Preface, letter to Paulinus). Later, in *De viris in* wrote (393) : " Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, is still writing, but I will abstain from passing any judgment lest I should be reproached with either flattery or flattery ", (Ch. 124). As a matter of fact, Saint Jerome, wholly taken up as he was with his critical labours, was unable to appreciate as it deserved the literary work of the Bishop of Milan, and especially his exegesis. Ambrose was not writing for posterity, but to satisfy the immediate needs of his flock, and all was for that done to his net. His writings were immensely popular and exercised an excellent influence.

³ *J. Z.*, 16, 389-410. French trans., P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 273-300.

* *A. Z.*, 16, 417-462.

J. L., 16, 465-524.

A treatise *De sacramento regenerationis sive de Philosophia*, often quoted by Saint Augustine, is now lost.

A similar fate has overtaken the *Exposition of the Failli*, mentioned by Theodoret.

D). Divers other writings : discourses, letters, verse

1. The discourses of Ambrose which were not turned into treatises are few in number and have been mentioned in the account of his life : these are the *Funeral Orations* (Satyrus, Valentinian II, Theodosius) and a discourse, *Against Auxentius*

2. Saint Ambrose's letters of which 91 are extant, nearly all deal with theological, moral or exegetical matters, while the others are business letters. The more important among the latter are : letters 17 and 18 to Valentinian II (on the Statue of Victory) ; 40 and 51 to Theodosius (on the incidents of Callinicum and Thessalonica); 20, 22 to Marcellina (on the besieging of his church and the discovery of the remains of Saints Gervasius and Protasius).

3. The so-called *Ambrosian* hymns 5 are very numerous, but only four of them are undoubtedly authentic :

Æterne Rerum Conditor (Sunday Lauds, in the *Part Hiemalis*).

Deus Creator Omnium.

fam Surgit Hora Tertia.

Veni, Redemptor Omnium.

It is quite possible, however, that eight other hymns should be attributed to him⁶. These hymns are usually composed of eight strophes each containing four acatalecti⁷ iambic dimeters?. This winged poetry, which retains with its simple and harmonious style all the purity of the classical tongue, became extremely popular with the people, unlike that of Saint Hilary which was constructed in a more learned and complicated manner. Saint Ambrose was the real creator of the *liturgical hymn* in the West.

¹ An historical work, *De excidio urbis Hierosolymitana*, P. L., 15, 1961 2jo] a free translation of Josephus' Jewish War, has been attributed to him, li] without serious grounds.

³ P. Pi 16, 1289-1354; 1347-1384; 1385-1406.

³ P. L., 16, 1007-1018.

⁴ P. L. y 16, 875-1286. French trans. D. de Bonrecueil, 1740; Extinctu | P. de Labriolle, op. cit., 37-161.

⁵ P. L., 16, 1409-1412. Unauthentic hymns, P. L., 17, 1171-1222. M V. Ermoni, *Ambroise (saint) hymnographie*, in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 1347-1352. 1

⁶ Among these are *Splendor paterna gloria* for Monday Lauds, and *PftA Christi munera*, from the Office of Apostles and Martyrs.

⁷ Four iambic feet usually occur in these verses; but sometimes the first lot contains a spondee instead of an iambus :

Aëtêr | ne rê || rûm côn | ditur.

The reputation he acquired from these compositions, together with the prestige he gained by his baptism of Saint Augustine, have caused the *Te Denin* to be ascribed to him. This work certainly dates from the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, but it was written by neither of these two great Doctors. It was most probably composed by Nicetas of Remesiana.

Style. Even in the absence of other examples, the skill in which this verse is composed would suffice to show the great intellectual culture of the Bishop of Milan. But all his works bear the same witness. In spite of certain shortcomings inseparable from hasty composition, all his writings reveal an "easy, clear and naturally elegant" style. It is the style of a "cultured statesman and a busy bishop"; yet whose words possessed the suavity capable of charming the rhetor Augustine while he was still a Manichaean and careless of the truth they contained: *Rerum autem incuriosus et contemptor astabam; et delectabar suavitate sermonis*².

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT AMBROSE.

Saint Ambrose's doctrinal influence will be considered in relation to the *Church, moral teaching*, and a number of *dogmatic questions*.

A). The Doctor of the Independence and the Unity of the Church.

This is the aspect which must be stressed in the first place, if we would understand the historical importance of the part played by the Bishop of Milan, even from a doctrinal point of view³. In this respect he differs from all the other Doctors: he was alone in being able to exert a political influence at a time when the question of the *relations of Church and State* was especially acute; in this field his activity was particularly successful. In addition to this his very keen perception of *Christian unity* made him very alive in the dangers which menaced it.⁴

¹ I. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. lai. chrét.*, p. 88.

² *Confess.* V, c. XIII, 23; *P. L.*, 32, 717.

³ See what has been said above regarding his character, p. 527. In all fairness "Ambrose cannot be judged on the merits of his literary work alone; the historical circumstances which gave rise to them must also be taken into account."

i. The relations of Church and State. Ambrose's teaching on this question is unhesitating. It may be reduced to three principles which appear to have been the mainspring of his conduct*.

a) The Church is independent of the State in its own domain; such is the first principle he made the Emperor accept, Theodosius in particular.

In spite of Constantine's favourable leanings, he lacked a bishop who could have acted as a firm mentor in his dealings with the Church | the influence of the two Eusebius only tended to make him interfere in religious questions. Later, Saint Athanasius⁷ and Saint Basil⁸ lifted up their voices in protest against the policy of Constantius II and Valens, but without result. After them, in the East, the Church remained far too subservient to the State, as it had done in the old Pagan Empire. In the West, Saint Hilary had also uttered energetic protestations⁴, but it was not until Saint Ambrose came, that the right of independence was admitted, not only in the general sense recognised by Constantine and Valentinian I, but also in its more remote application,

He made an exact distinction between the State, *res publica*, and *religio*. The latter possesses the right to liberty, first in questions of faith (*in causafidei*). But such liberty without a mockery, if the Church was not emancipated in the person of her representatives, that is, her episcopacy (*sacerdotium*) and her hierarchy (*ordo ecclesiasticus*), from State supervision and lay authority. He claimed for the Church the authority of the *jus ecclesiasticum*, the *jus sacerdotale* the bishops' right to be judged only by their fellow bishops. He went even farther than that, for the Emperors themselves he says, are subject to the bishops in matters of faith. Lastly, the churches and all ecclesiastical buildings are independent subject to the Emperors' authority; they cannot dispose of them freely as they can of other public buildings! *Ea quæ sunt divina Imperatoria potestati non sunt subiecta Ad Imperatorem palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesia*⁹.

* P. de Labriolle, *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁷ See above, p. 341. — ⁸ See above, p. 398.

⁴ Chiefly in the *Contra Constantium*. See P. BATIFFOL, *Le Siècle Apôstolique* p. 61-62. — ⁵ P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 61-62.

⁶ *In causa fidei*, *in causa*, inquam, fidei, episcopos solere de Imperialibus Christianis, non Imperatores de episcopis judicare. *Ep.* XXI, 4; *P. L.*, 16, 114.

⁷ Mention has already been made above of the resistance he made to the Empress Justina when she ordered him to deliver up certain of his dioceses to the Arians.

⁸ *Ep.* 20, 8; *P. L.*, 16, 997.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 19; *P. L.*, 16, 999.

6) The Church is the custodian of the moral law. It is her right and her duty to make everyone, even princes, submit to this law. The consequences of the incident at Thessalonica showed that it was not in vain she made use of the spiritual weapon of excommunication, even in matters not specifically religious, but purely moral in nature. This indirect authority of the Church over the Emperors was in no wise intended to encroach on their political rights.

Saint Ambrose cleverly remarks on this latter: the Emperors envy the priestly body far more than the bishops envy the State'. He calls to mind that the Jewish priesthood created kings, but exacts nothing of the kind for the Christian priesthood'. All he wants is to put a limit to Roman omnipotence, which easily tended to become tyrannical; such a restraining influence had great advantages. "It was an excellent thing that, without any suggestion of political domination, in the face of the imperial all-powerfulness, should be raised up another power, strong enough, although bereft of armed force, to impose on it a moral restraint until force it to avow its faults" 3*. Ambrose's whole idea may be summed up in that famous expression which should be taken as applying to the religious and moral order in which it was conceived: *Imperatorem intra Ecclesiam non supra Ecclesiam est*

c) Lastly, the Church has the right to protection by the State; the latter may not refuse its favour to the Church, and is obliged to withhold it from other forms of worship, for it is impossible for error to have the same rights as the truths. And in practice, as has been said, he obtained for the Church favours which were denied to other religions. Paganism, as such, was deprived of all its official rights and almost forced to disappear as a religious association 6. Nevertheless, no restrictions were imposed on the *personal liberty* of subjects of the Empire, and Ambrose blamed the violent treatment to which Priscillianus was subjected at the instance of the Spanish bishops, even though this was legal. It was repugnant to him that blood should be shed in any quarrel of a religious nature 7. As regards the conversion of the Arians, he trusted primarily to the intellectual and moral

1 ' Vulgo dici quod Imperatores sacerdotium magis optaverint, quam Imperium ■it.rrdotes. *Ibid.*, 23. *P. L.*, 16, 1001.

j ' Mgr Batiffol, *op. cit.*, 81. — 3 p. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, 25.

l ' *Sermo contr. Aux.* 36. *P. L.*, 16, 1018.

l Even non-Christians must recognise that Saint Ambrose was logical and per-
bully consistent when, on principle, he claimed privileges for the Church to
uliii h the possession of the truth gave her rights which error could not claim.

I 6 See P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 23-44. various prescriptions against the
liui: ins in the *Codex Theodosianus*, chiefly XVI, v, which were probably inspired

la Ambrose. — 7 *Ep.* 26, n. 3; *P. L.*, 16, 1042.

influence of the Catholics'. Even in his relations with the Pagans, several of whom had remained in the Roman administrative services, Ambrose acted in a friendly manner and even did them service when occasion² arose. All these details shed light on Ambrose's teaching and reveal him to us as combining strength and moderation in all his actions.

2. The Unity of the Church was almost as dear to the Bishop of Milan as its independence, and for him the centre of this unity was found in the *Roman Apostolic See*. The authority of this See is founded on Peter: *Ubi ergo Petrus, ibi Ecclesia; ubi Ecclesia, nulla mors, sed vita æterna*³. The Novatian schismatics, separated from the Church and the See of Peter have no part in its patrimony⁴. The Christian who possess "the grace of the true faith" are in communion "with the Catholic Bishops, that is to say, with the Roman Church"⁵. Lastly, in a letter to the Emperors, he declares that the Roman Church not only possesses "Sacrosanct and Apostolic faith", but that "from her flow to all (or all the Churches) the rights of that communion which is worthy of respect"⁶. The Roman Church is therefore the centre of Christian unity.

The perception of ecclesiastical unity and all that it implied was very strong in Ambrose, and it was this that moved him to intervene, as Bishop of Milan and counsellor of the Emperors, in the thorny question of the Schism of Antioch. The solutions he proposed in 381, in his letters 12 (to the Emperors) and 13 (to Theodosius) may be debated (in the second, he protested against the election of Flavian of Antioch instead of Paulinus, and against that of Nectarius of Constantinople instead of Maximus the Cynic, who he thought had a prior claim); but to him they seemed to possess the immediate advantage of securing unity; a unity based on communion with Rome. This was his 'lira care', and the reason why he wrote so bitterly of Flavian, who obstinately refused to consider the advances made both in the East and in the West for the purpose of coming to some understanding⁸. Flavian, I...

¹ *Defide*, in, xi, n. 89; *P. L.*, 16, 579.

² See P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

³ In *Psalm*, XL, n. 30.

⁴ *Non habent enim Petri hereditatem qui Petri sedem non habent.* *De l'rwI lentia*, η. 33. *P. L.* 16, 476.

⁵ *De Excessu fratris sui Satyri*, I, η. 47 \ *P. L.*, 16, 1306.

⁶ *Totius orbis Romani caput Romanam Ecclesiam atque illam sacrosanctam Apostolicam (Apostolorum) fidem, ne turbari sineret, obsecranda fuit chinmili vestra: inde enim in omnes veneranda communionis jura dimanarunt.* *Ep.* ■ n. 4; *P. L.*, 16, 946. This last text should be compared with that of 'mit Cyprian: *Unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est.* See p. 254.

⁷ *Ep.* 13, η. 5. *P. A.* 10, 922-923. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 141 i.]W

⁸ *Ep.* 56, n. 3. See F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche*, p. 284.

no many other Oriental bishop, was more intent on the rights of his See, or the general organisation of the East, than on the universal interests of Catholicity¹.

In reality, Theodosius was in agreement with Ambrose in this conception of Christian unity and the independence of the Church². It is regrettable that the bishops who were in close touch with him in the East did not nourish similar ideas, for they might have kept alive in their Church a sense of Catholic unity which it was gradually losing. Nectarius at Constantinople, although a worthy enough man, was weak. After him came Chrysostom, who knew what to say and what to do, but the Court no longer retained Theodosius' excellent dispositions; the great bishop was broken, and his example, valuable in itself, did not produce the happy results that Ambrose's labours produced in the West. The ideas of Saint Ambrose were not transient, for they passed into act. They became an example and an inspiration to many, and above all to the Popes; Saint Leo and Saint Gelasius, for instance, in the fifth century. The Middle Ages saw the revival, perhaps exaggerated in some directions, of the ideal of Christian society conceived by the bishop of Milan, the counsellor of Emperors.

B). Saint Ambrose, Moralist.

There is no better illustration of Ambrose's character than the part he played as Doctor of the Church; but another striking sidelight on his personality is to be found in his moral teaching. To this latter must be reduced his Scriptural work if it is to be properly understood.

I. His exegesis, as has been said, was hardly critical. It may be wondered whether Ambrose really intended to give the literal sense of each Biblical passage he chose as theme for his teaching. This of course is possible and seems to be indicated by his great admiration for Origen. If such is the case, it must be confessed that his exegesis, loaded as it is with allegorism, is really feeble if taken as a whole. But if, on the other hand, one seeks in his Scriptural works an explanation of Christian morality, based for the most part on a fact or a person in the Biblical narrative, his work

[¹ 'On Saint Ambrose's ecclesiology, see a note of P. Batiffol in *Le catholicisme* d' *Int Augustin*, p. 118-124.

Later, Theodosius declared: "Verily, there is only Ambrose to make me understand what a bishop really is". Dr Bronglie, *op cit.*, p. 160.

is really valuable. His spiritual accommodations perhaps do not always fulfil the required conditions¹; but they at least possess a real moral bearing. They are far from having their origin in the whims and caprice of the writer, but are solidly established, not only on a rare psychological insight and a keen perception of the spiritual needs of the faithful, but also on principles of sound morality drawn from the Scriptures². That is the true doctrinal domain of Saint Ambrose. He was as eminent in the direction of souls as he was in the government of Churches.

2. The principles of his moral teaching are to be found in the *De Officiis*. And it should be remarked that in this work Saint Ambrose cites the authority of philosopher, much less than that of the Scriptures, the words and narrative of which are found at every page. No doubt he retained the general outline sketched by Cicero; he adopted several notions of the early schools, especially Stoicism; sovereign good, distinction of reason and the passions, relative and perfect duties, classification of the four moral virtues (wisdom, justice, fortitude and temperance). Nevertheless, he was far more astonished by the shortcomings of their teaching than by the inspiration he found in it, so different was the spirit that animated his own doctrine, which he found in the word of God and which he set out in the name of the Church.

One of the distinguishing features of Saint Ambrose's moral teaching is its religious character³. Its real foundation was in the faith which finds its full expression in Christ, on Whom the Church is founded. Thus, in a word, morality is based on the one hand on *God*, Whose will is the criterion of duty, and on the other hand on the *Church*, which insofar as it were, the (social) form of justice, for in the Church, rights, prayers, work and trials are shared in common⁴. Coming from the pen of Saint Ambrose, this idea of the part occupied by the Church in moral life is not astonishing. Nor is it less worthy of mention as forming a complement to what has been said above regarding his teaching on the Church in general.

Duty is the moral obligation imposed on man to act in such or such a manner with reference to what is right or what is useful. Saint

¹ See the Introduction, p. 28-29.

² They also possess a very real apologetical value. It was while Augustine listened to Saint Ambrose explaining the Old Testament that he gradually and his prejudices against Catholicism. *Confess.*, V, c. XIV. Elsewhere appealing to his authority against Julian of Eclanum he calls him the *administrator of the Church*. "Audi alium excellentem Dei dispensatorem, quem veneror ut patrem" *Contra Ful.*, I, c. tu, io. — ³ P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 213-215.

⁴ *De Offic.*, i, c. XXIX, 142; *P. L.*, 16, 64-65.

Ambrose retained this word since he found it in the Scriptures where it possesses rather the meaning of a ritual function. Ambrose gave to it a much wider meaning'. Moreover, like the Stoics, he distinguished *relative duty* (καθήκον) from *absolute duty* (κατόρθωμα); to these expressions, however, he gave a new and entirely Christian signification. The former, which he also terms *officium medium*, is the object of the Divine precepts; the second, the *officium perfectum*, is accomplished by way of the counsels'. Hence, what was no more than pure theory for the philosophers can, and should, be carried into practice by the Christian, who is called to be perfect like his Father in Heaven, Whose works of mercy should more especially be his model³⁴

The doctrine of the last end, or the sovereign good, was well known to the philosophers. Cicero, however, does not speak of it in his *De Officiis*'. This, no doubt, was because he was treating in his work, as all Pagan moralists had done, of the happiness to be obtained in this world, and in his second book he indicates the best means of attaining it; this is virtue itself, so *useful* in gaining men's hearts and in obtaining their help and assistance. Such utilitarian morality is certainly honest, but it is very worldly. Saint Ambrose corrected and perfected it; basing his argument on the Gospel, he showed that no happiness can exist except in *eternal life*, and thus the things of this world, far from leading to happiness, often act as a hindrance, whilst on the contrary trials and misfortune can be a more direct means of attaining it. Furthermore, the life of blessedness partly begins in this world, in peace of conscience and the security of innocence⁵.

Such principles give a sound and elevated character to Saint Ambrose's moral teaching. Cicero, in the third book of his *De officiis*, had endeavoured to prove that what is right is never opposed to what is useful⁶; but more often than not he had to content himself with making a compromise between duty and the passions. But Saint Ambrose would allow no shuffling in these matters, since the only source of duty is what is good and right. He showed that the conflicts which the philosophers took for granted do not really exist?, and proves by the words of the Scriptures and by the examples of Christ and the saints that it is never permissible to seek one's own good to the detriment of one's neighbour⁸.

³ *Ibid.*, c. vin, 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Xi, 36, 37.

⁵ *Ibid.*, XI, 38 sq.

⁶ This is a grave defect in a treatise of general moral philosophy. He speaks of it in the *Academica*, the *Tusculana Disputationes*, and chiefly in the *IV Finibus*.

⁷ Tantus enim splendor honestatis est, ut vitam beatam efficiant tranquillitas inima et securitas innocentia. *De offic.*, II, c. I, I. See also *ibid.*, c. ill, 8; o v, 18; c. XIV, 66; etc.

⁸ Basing his argument on the Stoic doctrine of the identity of happiness and virtue.

⁹ *De offic.* III, c. II, 9. — ⁸ *Ibid.*, c. III sq.

3. The bishop also shows this superiority of Christian morality in the explanation of the special virtues with which he deals. First of all, there exist four fundamental virtues | which are the only sources of moral good and beauty (*decorum*): *wisdom*, or prudence, which has truth for its object; *justice* 3, which sets out the duties towards God, the State, parents, in brief, towards all men, and which even urges liberality and generosity; *fortitude* 4, which tends to the contempt of exterior things and aids the accomplishment of great and difficult undertakings; lastly, *temperance* 5, which comprises various elements: "tranquillitas animi, studium mansuetudinis, moderationis gratia, honesti cura, decoris consideratio".

Among the precepts meant especially for the clergy should be mentioned *chastity* 6,* and, more generally, that modesty (*verecundia*) which is so becoming to youth 7. Ambrose also gives wise advice regarding the exterior behaviour of the Christian *preacher* 8.

But it is when he speaks of duties towards God and one's neighbour that Ambrose far surpasses the Pagan philosophers. Cicero passed over the duties of *religion* in complete silence; but for a Christian these are fundamental. The word *neighbour* meant little to Cicero except the high Roman aristocracy by whom the Empire was administered; at the outside he included the educated and cultured class; of the existence of other men he was hardly aware. Saint Ambrose on the contrary stressed at length in Book II the duties of charity, beneficence and hospitality with so much vigour that it is evident he considered them a striking proof of the moral superiority of Christianity 9.

4. Saint Ambrose's moral doctrine was naturally linked up with a sound asceticism, that is to say, the use of means, which are specially adapted for the attainment of perfection. He spoke most eloquently of the practice of *virginity*, and based his exhortations on a *doctrine* which was very dear to him. Virginity is superior to marriage; he did not deny that

' *De offic.*, I, C. XXV, 116 sq. — ' *ibid.*, c. XXVI. — 3 *Ibid.*, c. XXVII sq.

4 *Ibid.*, c. XXXV sq. — 5 *Ibid.*, c. XLIII sq. — 6 *Ibid.*, c. L, 247 sq.

' *Ibid.*, c. XVII-XXIV. — 8 *Ibid.*, c. xix sq.

9 The great *social importance* of this teaching is obvious. And yet certain have ventured to affirm that the decadence of Roman society began with Saint Ambrose's *De officiis*. The doctrine of charity produced far more works *useful* to *society* than did the aristocratic preoccupations of statesmen like Cicero.

marriage was good', but it is surpassed by the practice of the evangelical counsels which enables the Christian to produce perfect acts (κατόρθωσα) ³. Indeed, it leads the soul to the mystical marriage with Christs. It makes angels of souls, for Christ is the Lord of the angels. It is an altar on which is immolated a pure victim (*hostia pudoris, victima castitatis*) ⁴. It imposes great duties on those who embrace it, and on this subject Ambrose is inexhaustible. Especially does he exhort virgins to seek Christ ⁵, to strive to know Him in His twofold nature, divine and human ⁶; which is an effect of prayer, so necessary to virgins ⁷. Further, virginity is a heavenly gift; it is but a pilgrim in this world; its true home is in heaven ⁸.*

The state of virginity is therefore in some sort a divine institution; and it was founded by Mary. She is the ideal model of all purity, for she always remained a virgin, even in the Divine Birth and until the end of her life. Such is the subject of the treatise *De institutione Virginis*, in which the controversial note is combined with tender piety ⁹. This treatise is one of the early writings which have more especially helped in spreading the devotion to Mary in the Church.

The asceticism of Saint Ambrose, thus crowned with his fine teaching on virginity, seems to be inspired with a true and pure mysticism. This impression is made yet stronger when one meditates his beautiful thoughts on Our Lord, which he seems to have instinctively scattered through the pages of his works and which are worthy indeed of Saint Bernard's pen: *Omnia igitur habemus in Christo... Omnia Christus est nobis. Si vulnus curare desideras, medicus est; si febribus æstuas, fons est; si gravaris iniquitate, justitia est; si auxilio indiges, virtus est; si mortem times, vita est; si cælum desideras, via est; si tenebras fugis, Lux est; si cibum quaeris, alimentum est. Gustate igitur et videte quoniam suavis est Dominus : beatus vir qui sperat in eo (Ps. XXXIII, 9) "* ¹⁰.

¹ *De virginibus*, I, vi, 24.

² See above for the distinction of καθήκον and κατόρθωμα, p. 541.

³ *De virginibus*, I, c. ill, I. *Exhort, virg.*, ix, 58.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Xi, 65. — ⁵ *Exhort, virg.*, ix, 58.

⁶ *De virginibus*, I, vni, 46. Where Christ is found : *De virginitate*, Vili, 46.

⁷ *Exhort, virg.*, X, 70.

⁸ *De virginibus*, I, c. v, n. 20. Si enim ibi est patria, ubi genitale domici*
lium, in cado profecto est patria castitatis. Itaque hic advena, ibi incola est.

⁹ Against Bonosus and his blasphemies.

¹⁰ *De virginitate*, c. XVI, 96.

Christ is the source of all virtue J. In a letter to the Bishop Felix, whom he had consecrated, he describes with great feeling the wealth of the Christian sanctuary, in which is found, together with the Scriptures which contain the doctrine of wisdom, the holy tabernacle in which Christ dwells and speaks to us and in Whom we possess all things : *ubi enim Christus, ibi omnia* 2. Ambrose goes still further ; spiritual gifts can only come from Christ; peace and justice are the signs that He is present : *ubi enim pax, ibi Christus* 3. Christ is in the soul; He walks therein by His Spirit⁴ His sacred action. He who receives and greets Him with love, places, as it were, a devout kiss upon His feet⁵. All this, of course, is the purest allegorism. Ambrose's exegesis, so reminiscent of Origin, also reveals the mystical character of the Bishop of Milan; often it indicates his possession of the Alexandrian gnostic's great and clear knowledge of God. Can it be concluded from this that in Ambrose the contemplative takes precedence of the spiritual director? This would not appear to be the case. There is no doubt that his moralism⁶ is the distinctive feature of his spiritual doctrine.

C) Saint Ambrose, Theologian.

The Bishop of Milan was not a theologian in the strict sense of the word. It is useless to search his works for the elaboration of a truly original idea, accompanied by deep philosophical speculation on one or the other mysteries which are proposed by faith or attacked by heretics. All he required was a theology which would serve as a firm basis for his moral teaching, which he would willingly have reduced to the proportions of a comprehensive catechism. Here we will do no more than give brief indications on a number of special matters with which he dealt explicitly.

I. The Trinity. Saint Ambrose conceives the mystery of the Trinity in the Oriental manner. He considers the *Persons* before the *Nature*. He treats first of the *Father* as principle of the two other Persons; the Father is the "source" and the "root" of the Son⁸. The Second Person is called

¹ *Defide*, III, c. VII, 52. — 3 *Epist.* 3, n. 4. — 3 *Epist.* 63, n. 4.

⁴ *Ambulat enim Christus in pectoribus singulorum.* *Epist.* 41, η. 12.

⁵ *Religiose osculo velut quædam deambulantibus Domini lambit vestigia.* *Epsa*, 41, n. 15. — ⁶ For the sense we give to this word, see p. 30.

⁷ See p. 436 for this Oriental conception.

⁸ *Fons Pater Filii est, quia radix Pater Filii est.* *De Fide*, IV, c. X, 132.

he *Son* inasmuch as He is "engendered", and the Word inasmuch as He is "spiritually" produced (*ex corde eructavit*)* but not in the manner of a word which is "uttered" exteriorly, nor of the "interior" word, which is a purely accidental quality²* He is born by reason of a natural necessity, which is superior both to free will and constraint³. The Son, in His turn, is the "source" of the *Holy Ghost* 4. Nevertheless Ambrose does not say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son, for he takes this word as meaning the mission *ad extra* 5. Furthermore, between the Persons there is no inequality⁶* This realistic conception of the Trinity is truly traditional and possesses great advantages as regards Christian piety, although from a philosophical viewpoint it is less useful than that of Saint Augustine 7.

2. Christology. Saint Ambrose recognises in Christ the existence of two truly distinct natures⁸* and even two wills⁹; on the other hand, he affirms no less energetically that Christ is really one (*unns*) and that in Him may not be distinguished He Who is "from the Father" and He Who is born "of the Virgin" 10. Saint Ambrose, like Saint Hilary II, explains the *Redemption* by the realist theory of expiation and satisfaction; Christ freely offered Himself to the Father as a superabundant ransom for us by His Blood 12. Sometimes, it is true, Ambrose explains the theory of the rights of the devil, both in its tempered¹³ and in its most rigid form¹⁴; but this may be regarded as no more than an

* *De virginibus*, HI, c. I, 3,

De fide, IV, c. vit, 72 sq. Saint Ambrose refuted Arianism according to Saint Basil, *Hom.* 27, *Cont. Ananas*. The Arians had taken certain expressions employed by Fathers of preceding centuries in too literal a fashion.

† *De fide*, IV, c. IX, 102-104,

‡ *Sons Spiritus Sancti* (*De Spirit. S.*, I, c. xv, 152), as the Father is "fons filii". This is a clear indication of the sense of the original Oriental formula: *In patre per Filium*.

De Spirit. S., I, c. tx, 119. — 6 *De Spirit. S.*, III, c. It sq.

All these advantages may of course be found in Saint Augustine, but his method is more recondite and less accessible to the faithful as a whole than the literal method.

" *De Incarn. Dom. Sac.*, V, 35 sq.

De fide, II, c. VII, 53-58.

De Incarn. Dom. Sac., 35.

" V. Hilary sometimes seems to admit the *theory of union* (see above p. 352): *Trinit.*, II, 24; tx, 4. *In Math.*, tv, 12. *In Psalm.* 61, 2. But as a rule he adopts the *realist theory*. J. RIVIERE, *op. cit.*, p. 225-232.

" *In Lucam*, lit, 48; YU, 114. — " z" *In can.*, tv, 11-12.

† *In Lucan.*, vu, 114-117. See also *Epist.* 72, n. 8, 9.

oratorical presentation in exaggerated form of the usual doctrine of expiation.

3. Sacraments. Saint Ambrose in the *De mysteriis*, and the author of the *De Sacramentis*, have formulated in regard to the Sacraments a number of general ideas that are worthy of notice. They “distinguish excellently the rite itself from the grace it produces in the person to whom it is administered; moreover, they are no strangers to the idea of an efficacious symbol; the rite — in this case the water, or the ablution — is the figure of the interior purification which results from baptism; in the Eucharist, that which is seen after the consecration is the sign of what is real.” But as the Eucharist is a “permanent Sacrament”, Saint Ambrose was led to conceive of baptism in the same way, and to attribute exaggerated importance to the blessing of the baptismal waters ².

With regard to the Eucharists, Saint Ambrose does not content himself with affirming “the traditional equation of the bread to the body, of the wine to the blood; he renders the meaning of the consecration of the *oblata* more precise; it consists in the conversion of the nature of the bread and of the nature of the wine; he states that this conversion is produced by the words of Christ at the Last Supper. The Eucharistic Body is *spirit*, that is to say, invisible, palpable like God Himself”⁴.

Penance, of which Saint Ambrose speaks in his treatise on this subject, is not that which is necessary for the *delicta leviora*, which may probably be redeemed by good works, it remits the *delicta graviora*, for which public penance is exacted and which can be vouchsafed only once. It comprises : a) secret confession⁵, made to the bishop or to a priest, who decides the penance to be performed; b) the *exomologesis* or public expiation by which the sinner gives satisfaction

• I. Tixeront, *Hist. Dorm.*, n, p. 307. — 2 *Ibid.*, p. 308.

3 In the *De Mysteriis*.

4 Mgr Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie*, p. 345. See *ibid.*, p. 335-345; and on til *De Sacramentis*, p. 346-349.

5 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 321-325.

6 Saint Ambrose often speaks in a very general way, and may be understood as referring to a confession made to God. But in many places he is evidently referring to confession made to a priest (*De Pant.*, II, c. ix, 86, and c. x, 87) and Paulinus tells us that he himself received the secret and detailed confession of sinners. See P. Galtier, *La Pénitence*, in *Diet. Afol.*, col. 1810-1811, 1826, 1851-1852.

to God before the Church; c) solemn *reconciliation* by the laying on of hands by the bishop, on Holy Saturday. The efficacy on this pardon accorded by the priests in the name of God is strongly affirmed, against the Novatians, by the Bishop of Milan in the beginning of his work '.

4. Eschatology², as treated by Ambrose, shows traces of Origen's influence and possesses a number of weaker points. On the one hand he does not admit that all the just may be accorded the *Beatific Vision* before the resurrection; this is a privilege granted only to a few great saints of the two Testaments, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs. On the other hand, although he admits that *hell utili be demal* for devils, infidels and apostates, he believes that all Christians will be finally saved by their faith³; this is an obvious exaggeration of the efficacy of this virtue. It is true that Ambrose tempered this teaching by distinguishing several degrees in the resurrection (four or five) until souls are perfectly purified by passing through fire. Thus the elect enter into eternal happiness only by degrees. Apart from his ideas on the salvation of all Christians, his teaching contains the gist of the present doctrine of the Church regarding purgatory, although it is obscured by several less certain accessories⁴. Saint Augustine's genius was necessary to clarify the certain principles which are firmly based on Scripture and tradition.

CHAPTER XII.

Christian Poets.

Special Bibliography.

Studies on the *whole of the matter in this chapter* (see the notes for the author): J. Kayser, *Beitriige zur Gesch. u. Erklarung der altchristlichen Hymnen*, Paderborn, 1881-1886 (2nd ed.). G. Boissier, *Origines de la poesie latine chrét.*, in *La fin du paganisme*, Paris, 1891, li, p. 3-177.

¹ *De Panit.*, I, c. il sq.

² See the doctrinal synopsis outlined by J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, 143-35°. — ³ *Psalm*, cxvii, *Sermo* 20, n. 23, 24, 29; *Sermo* 22, n. 26.

⁴ A similar teaching is found in the works of a number of Oriental authors, influenced by Origen. This is especially to be remarked in Saint Jerome.

G. Grappe, in *L'hymnologie chrétienne*, in *Revue cl.fr.*, 1902 (t. xxxi, p. 165-182; study on C. Albin's, *Lapoésie du Bréviaire*. O. Barkenhewer, *Gesichte*, ni, p. 428-456. P. DE Labriolle, *Hist. lit. hit. chrét.*, p. 414-444 and 596-636. H. Leclercq, *Hymnes*, in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 2901-2910. Various texts, in Felix Clément, *Carmina a poetis Christianis excerpta*, Paris; French translations in *Histoire de la poésie chrétienne depuis le IV^e siècle jusqu'au XV^e*, Paris, 1857 (1876). A number of translated texts in A. Poizat, *Poètes chrétiens!* Lyon-Paris, 1902.

L CHRISTIAN POETRY IN ITALY.

The poetry which was cultivated by Pope *Saint Damasus* and with greater success by *Saint Ambrose*, was followed in the fourth century by a number of veritable masterpiece! which, in the case of the Spaniard, Prudentius, and the Gaul, Paulinus of Noia, may rightly be compared with those of the great profane writers: even *Saint Ambrose* does not equal them, perhaps on account of the slender volume of his poetic work. Nevertheless many interesting attempts at both liturgical and extra-liturgical verse were made in Italy, and these are worthy of notice.

Optatianus Porphyrius appears to have been the earliest Christian poet to write in Rome. But this officer of the Court, who became Prefect of Rome in the time of Constantine, was a native of Africa*; moreover the poems which we still possess are not truly religious, unlike those of his compatriot, *Victorinus* who also lived in Rome.

Proba, daughter of a patrician Roman family and wife of a Roman Prefect, made an attempt about the middle of the fifth century to write the Bible in verse, or rather to adapt Virgil's verse, chiefly that of the *Aeneid*, to Biblical scenes: in the Old Testament, the Creation, the Fall, the Flood, and in the New Testament, the story of Our Lord.

* The African, *Commodianus*, seems to have been the first Christian poet in the West; and what a poet! See above, p. 269-270.

3 *P. L.*, 19, 391. "Thirty of his poems are extant, consisting of pleas to Constantine in the form of panegyrics, figured poems in various metres and of inconceivable subtlety, set out in the form of acrostics, geometrical figures, Greek and Latin sayings, monograms of Christ, a palm, an altar, a flute, a hydraulic organ". P. Monceaux, *Hist. de la littérature latine chrétienne*, Paris. 1924, p. 79.

3 See above, p. 331. These hymns, *P. L.*, 8, 1139-1146, written in a loose metre, are not lacking either in lyrical quality or devotion. Three of the Christian poems which are attributed to him are not authentic.

from His birth to the Ascension. This hybrid composition contains 694 hexameters¹.

Sedulius², lived at the end of the period now under discussion. Together with Saint Ambrose, he is the only Italian poet to show signs of truly original and Christian inspiration. He wrote probably about 430³. All we know of his life is that he was a priest, that he had studied philosophy in Italy, and had lived in Greece. His chief work is the *Carmen paschale*;⁴ a poem in hexameter verse, comprising no less than five books; the first, which is devoted to certain Biblical miracles of the Old Testament, forms a kind of introduction. The four following books tell the story of Christ, with especial regard to His miracles, according to the Gospels and chiefly that of Saint Matthew. The author does not hesitate to add allegorical paraphrases and pious meditations to the Gospel story. The last book, which treats of the Passion, comments the words of Saint Paul: "Etenim Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus" (I Cor., V, 7), and gives the explanation of the general title of the work. The style and prosody of the book, taken as a whole, show Sedulius to have been a true disciple of the classical masters. His verse is simple and often clearer than the rather pedantic prose of the *Opus paschale* (prose version of the *Carmen*, made by himself).

Two of Sedulius' hymns in honour of Christ are still extant: the first in 55 couplets, the second in regular iambic dimeters, arranged in strophes of four verses⁶. A part of the latter has been incorporated in the liturgy; the four first strophes (*A solis ortus cardine*) at Christmas, and some of the following strophes in the Epiphany hymn, *Crudelis Herodes Deum*.

¹ *Centones Virgiliani*, P. L., 19, 803-818. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1888, t. xvi.

Editions: P. L., 19: *Corpus* of Vienna, 1885, t. x (Ed. Huëmer). Studies:

I. IHemer, *De Sedulii poetæ vita et scriptis commentatio*, Vienna, 1878.

I ('andel. *De clausulis*... (Thesis on the *Opus paschale*), Toulouse, 1904.

between 425 and 450, says Bardenhewer (*Geschichte*, iv, 643), according to Iliemer.

I L., 19, 549-752. The *Opus paschale* accompanies the poem.

I L., 19, 753-762. The couplets are in the form of *versus serpentine*, the first of the second verse being the same as the beginning of the first; here is the first couplet:

*Gloria magna Patri, semper tibi, gloria Nate,
Cum Sancto Spiritu gloria magna Patri.*

I A P. L., 19, 763-770.

II. CHRISTIAN POETRY IN GAUL.

A) In the fourth century a richer poetic vein is found in Gaul than in Italy. In addition to Saint Hilary, who has already been studied, there is a fairly large number of Christian poets who made a name for themselves. It will suffice to give but a short mention to most of these, but Saint Paulinus of Noia merits special notice.

The *Laudes Domini* (between 316 and 323) seems to be the earliest Christian poem to be written in Gaul; the unknown author, on the occasion of a miracle which took place in the district of Editen» (Autun?) — a dead woman raised her hand in greeting to her sorrowing husband — sings a hymn to Christ, Creator and Saviour, and finishes by wishing prosperity to the Emperor Constantine.

Several other anonymous poems of the fourth century are still extant. All that need be mentioned here are the *De Sodoma* dealing with the destruction of that town, and the *De Jona et Ninive*, which treats of the deliverance of Ninive, and sheds interesting light on the taste for paraphrases of Biblical incidents which was prevalent in the period.

Cyprian the Gaul, between 408 and 430, composed a poetic *Heptateuchs*, in which the inspired historical books are rendered in verse. This work is poor both as regards prosody and style, although it is evident that the author, who is known to us only by this work, was a cultured man and familiar with the classics.

Endelechius or *Severus Sanctus*, a rhetor, who is known to have corresponded with Saint Paulinus, is the author of a delightful little bucolic poem (*carmen bucolicum*) which deals with the efficacy of the Sign of the Cross.* The Cross covers the whole world with its brand, and its fruit is the food of mankind.

Cl. Marius Victor, also a rhetor, probably of Marseilles, who died after 425, composed a poem in three books entitled *Alethia* (Ἀλήθεια) on the origins of mankind from the Creation until the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

Orientius, Bishop of Augusta Ausciorum (Audi)†, at the beginning of the fifth century, composed a *commonitorium* in 2 books. This work

* P. 61, 1091-1094.

† See the list drawn up by P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, in the Appendix *Tableau VI*. This author mentions 24.

‡ This poem, the following, and several others are found in *P. L.*, 2, 1101 sq. 1107 sq., among Tertullian's *spuria*. Re-edited in the *Corpus* of Vienna.

♦ See P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 418 sq.

§ *Corpus cd* Vienna, 1891, t. XXIII. — 6 *P. L.*, 19, 797-800.

¶ *P. L.*, 61, 937-970, and *Corpus* of Vienna, 1888, t. xvi. See these in A. Bourgoïn, Paris, 1883, and Saint-Gambier, Marseille, 1884.

§ The critics are generally agreed that this author is to be identified with the bishop who acted as intermediary between the Visigoths of Toulouse and the Roman Empire, 437-439.

is a moral exhortation written in elegiac couplets'. The really practical advice contained in these poetic sermons is sincere and zealous, and the descriptions which illustrate it are full of life, although one critic writes that the work reveals a "certain impotency which prevents ecclesiastical literature from rising to simple and severe forms"'.

Ausonius (310-395 circa), the brilliant but frivolous poet of Bordeaux, taught rhetoric for a long time in his birthplace, and also spent his last years there after having been preceptor of the princes at the Court, and even Consul. His work is more profane than religious in character. In his skilful and finely polished verses he sings his country, his parents, his friends and the Emperors. In addition to this he composed epigrams, idylls and letters in verse. Although his religion was not very profound, he had the faith, and wrote a number of devout poems: *n paschal prayer* (Idyll 1), a *morning prayer* (in the poem entitled *Ephemeris*). But in reality his true glory, as far as we are concerned, is that of having been the master of Paulinus of Noia, whom moreover he tried to dissuade (in three letters in verse) from renouncing his worldly life when he was so moved by grace.

B) Saint Paulinus of Noia 4 (353-431).

Meropius Pontius Anicius Paulinus was born at Bordeaux of one of the most illustrious Roman patrician families. He was first the pupil and then the friend of Ausonius. While still young he took his place in the Senate, was Consul in 378, and then Governor of Campania (379). He preferred to live at Noia rather than Capua. It was at this former place that he first felt the first strong promptings of grace, which finally decided him to embrace a life of perfection

¹ *P. L.*, 61, 977-1000. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1888, t. xvi. Studies: L. Bevinger, *Le Poème d'Orientais*, Paris, 1903. L. Guérard, *Les derniers Oanaux sur saint Orens*, Auch, 1904. The other works attributed to Oriendus are of doubtful authenticity.

² Fauriel, *Hist. de la Gaule nérid.*, i, 430. Quoted by P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 624.

³ Editions: *P. L.*, 19, 823-958. New ed. in *Monumenta* of Berlin, 1883. Studies: C. Jullian, *Ausane et son temps*, in *Bev. hist.*, 1881-1892.

⁴ Villani, *Sur les chants chrétiens d'Ausane*, in *Bev. des Etudes ano.*, 1906. ⁵ Pichón, *Les derniers écrivains profanes*, Paris, 1906. On the correspondence of Ausonius and Paulinus, see A. Puech, Paris, 1888; P. DE Labriolle, Paris, 1910.

⁶ Editions: *P. L.*, 61, 153-710. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1894, t. xxix-xxx. Studies: André Baudrillart, *Saint Paulin, év. de Noie* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1904. F. Lagrange, *Hist. de Saint Paulin de Noie*, 2 vol., Paris, 1877. Also G. Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, t. II, and the above mentioned studies of A. Puech and P. de Labriolle.

There were three great Christian Gallic poets bearing the name of Paulinus. The last are: a) *Paulinus of Béziers*, author of a satire on the manners of the day, J. n. 400-419 (*Zt p.*, 61, 969-972, among the works of Marius Victor); b) *Paulinus of Pelta* (Ausonius' grandson) and *Paulinus of Périgucux* both wrote in the end of the fifth century; they will be studied later.

at the time of his baptism in 389 or 390. On this occasion he distributed to the poor a part of the great wealth he possessed in Aquitaine, and of which he had been in peaceful enjoyment since his return to Gaul about 380. At first he withdrew to Spain, his wife Theresia's country, where in 394 the Bishop of Barcelona ordained him priest. The following year he went to Noia in Italy, where he spent the rest of his life, entirely immersed in a life of asceticism and poverty, together with his wife who had also vowed herself to an austere life. In 399 he was made Bishop of Noia, and henceforth he devoted himself wholly to the spiritual and temporal welfare of his flock. He died in 431, renowned for his holiness and his great charity towards the poor and afflicted *

This friend of the humble and the poor, yet whose rank procured him a place among the great of this world, was also in close touch with the most illustrious men of his time, as may be seen from his letters² Saint Ambrose, Saint Augustine, Saint Jerome, Sulpicius Severus, Nicetas of Remesiana, and Saint Eucherius, to mention only the writers. His sweetness of *character*, his kindness and mildness are marvellously portrayed in these letters: "His ardent and loving disposition, his charitable Christian zeal, his continual desire for moral perfection are felt in every line. There is perhaps no other correspondence in which candour shines forth with such clearness; his was a soul of crystal". 51 of Paulinus' *letters* are extant. Some of them are valuable as an aid to historical study³. Among these letters is found one of his sermons on charity⁴, the only one now extant; the panegyric of Theodosius (end of 394) is lost. To these should be added the *Passion of Saint Genesius of Arles* and that completes the list of Paulinus' prose works. On the whole it is remarkable for its easy elegance, in spite of a little turgidity and verbosity in the style.

Paulinus' poetic work is the most famous part of his literary legacy to posterity. It comprises 36 poems, of which

¹ For the tradition which tells of the captivity of Paulinus, see A. Bahr DRILLART, *Op. cit.* p. 167-170.

² P. L., 61, 153-420.

³ *Ep.* 18, life of Saint Victricius of Rouen: *Ep.* 31, on the discovery of the Holy Cross by Saint Helena; *Ep.* 45, Eulogy of Melania the Elder.

⁴ *Sermo de Gaiophylacio*: P. L., 61, 344-350.

⁵ P. L., 61, 418-420.

fifteen are devoted to *Saint Felix of Noia*, for whom Paulinus had a special devotion from the time he came to Noia, and to whom he consecrated a new poem every time his anniversary came round. Some of them run to considerable length; they narrate either the life of the Saint, ornamented with charming incidents inspired by the poet's tender piety, or the miracles which took place at his tomb.

Among the other poems may be mentioned :

1. Poems to and in, epistles addressed to *Ausonius*, in reply to those that the rhetor had written him to keep him in the world; the nobility of their sentiments render them far superior to those of the master.

2. Poem 22 (Epistle to *Jovius*) is a kind of *manual of Christian Poetry*; Paulinus shows that the true sources of poetic inspiration are the beauties of creation considered as works of God, and the Sacred Books which contain His word and the story of the wonders He has performed. Similar to this work of the "Christian Horace" is the epistle to Nicetas (*propempticon*, wishes for a successful journey, Poem 17, in Sapphic strophes).

3. *Occasional poems*: 25, wedding-song for the wedding of Julian (future Bishop of Eclanum) and of Ia; 35, on the death of the young Celsus; 24, on the shipwreck of Martinianus.

4. Attempts at *translating the Psalms*: Psalm I, in iambic trimeters; Psalms II and cxxxvi, in hexameters.

5. Lastly, *metrical inscriptions*, some composed for Saint Felix of Noia, others in honour of Saint Martin. They were to be placed in the Villa of Sulpicius Severus at Primuliacum.

In spite of a certain prolixity, Paulinus' poetic work makes easy and agreeable reading on the whole. He had an admirable gift for writing verse, and, as Saint Jerome wrote to him, could have been a great poet had he taken greater pains (*Ep.* 49). But "whatever may have been the reason, whether it was his easy-going disposition, or a great lord's disdain for the meticulous details of style, or a saint's contempt for transient things, or perhaps all these together, Paulinus rarely troubled to give a final polish to his works²." But it should be remembered that he did not take poetry very seriously, but rather as an agreeable pastime or a means of interesting his friends. He nevertheless wrote a number of works, which, although not especially remarkable for originality, or clarity and liveliness of style, are at least outstanding for

¹ *P. L.*, 61, 603-608. See A. Baudrillart, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

² *K. Baudrillart, op. cit.*, p. 88.

fineness of feeling, acute observation and pleasant expression. He will always be thought of as "a charming poet" *.

III. CHRISTIAN POETRY IN SPAIN.

Spain produced the greatest Christian poet of this period, His name is *Prudentius*. It would appear also that it was in Spain that the poet Juvenius 1 first adapted Biblical scenes in the form of verse. All that is known of the latter author is that he was of noble birth and a priest 3. About the year 330 he wrote a *Gospel History* in four books, which as a rule follows the sacred text, chiefly that of Saint Matthew. Often enough the exigencies of the metrical form obliged him to modify to a large extent the inspired words. In spite of the poet's skill, this adaptation to the Virgilian mould was too laborious, and the simplicity of the Gospels suffered in the changed. Perhaps it is not so much the actual work that should be criticised as the idea from which it sprang.

Prudentius.

In the year 405, at the age of fifty-seven, Prudentius himself published a collection of his poems, which was preceded by a foreword 6 giving his age (he was born in 348), a broad outline of his past life and a list of his works. He explains in this foreword that the present work was an expiation for the faults of his youth, which he frankly confesses in general terms. He had been a Christian since childhood; but for many years he was careless of religion and wholly taken up with worldly pursuits. He was first an

1 Remark by P. Monceaux, who also notes the following traits in Paulino's poetry: "Ingenious ideas, pretty landscapes, natural and picturesque description».] portraits, descriptions of manners of the time, humorous sketches, anecdotes alidi witticisms". *Hist. liti. lai. chrét.*, p. no.

0 P. L., 19, 53-346. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1891, t. xxiv. Study in Latin by H. Widmann, Breslau, 1905. — 3 HEBRON., *De viris*, 84.

¶ The words of Mary to Gabriel: *Ecce ancilla Domini; fiat mihi secundum A verbum tuum*, are rendered:

"Virgo dehinc: Domino/amulam nunc eccejubenti,
Ut tua verba sonant cernis servire paratam" Book i, v. ria-nj. 1

5 Edition: P. L., 59-60. Studies: A. Puech, *Prudence, Etude sur la poëtiA chrétienne au V^e siècle*, Paris, 1888. P. Aillard, in *Rev. des quest. hist.*, t. Jg (*Prudence historien*), t. 36 (*Rome au IV^e siècle*, according to Prudentius), t. 31 (*L'hagiographie au IV^e siècle*). G. BOISSIER, *La fin du paganisme*, t. II, A. Maigret, *Le poète chrétien, Prudence*, Paris, 1903. P. de LabriOM, *Hist. liti. lai. chrét.*, p. 596-622. — * P. L., 59, 767-776.

advocate; later he entered on an administrative career, and with the support of Theodosius obtained the highest posts, probably that of Provincial Governor. When he was about the age of fifty he abandoned his worldly ambitions (395-400), and in order to make reparation for the past he devoted all his talents as a writer to combating error, singing the praises of virtue and glorifying God and the saints. It may be that his journey to Rome about 400 was a part of this purpose. After the appearance of his poems in 405 he disappears from history and the date of his death is unknown.

His works may be classed under three heads according to their subject :

a) controversial works ;

b) allegorical or moral works;

c) liturgical works.

i. Controversial works. In this category are three writings : *Contra Symmachum*, *Apotheosis* and *Hamartigenia*.

a) The *Contra Symmachum*¹ is a refutation of Paganism in two books. The work was written in 402 or 403, either because at this time Symmachus renewed his tentatives of 383, or because the poet took Symmachus' Memorandum, previously refuted by Saint Ambrose², as a convenient pretext for presenting his dissertation. In *the first book* (658 hexameters) he chiefly describes the triumph of Christianity over Paganism, which, in spite of its last spasms, he shows to be no more dangerous to the Church than was the viper for Saint Paul at Malta (this incident is mentioned in the foreword). In *the second book* (1131 hexameters, in addition to the foreword) the author, who does not hesitate to borrow from Saint Ambrose, pays homage to Symmachus' dialectical skill and proceeds to refute him point by point. The Spanish poet's patriotism equals, and perhaps transcends, that of the Roman Senator.

Λ) The *Apotheosis*⁴, perhaps written with a mind to the rise of Friscillianism, was directed against the negators of *Christ's divinity*: In 1085 hexameters, the poet refutes all those who deny it, either indirectly by their refusal to recognise the Trinity, such as the *Unitarians* (Palripassians, verses 1-177, or Modalists, 178-320) and the *Jews* (321- or directly, such as the *Ebionites* (551-781), more Jewish than Christian, who, while recognising Christ, refuse to admit his divine nature. After a long discussion on the nature of the soul and the punishments reserved to the wicked in the next life (782-951), the author

¹ L. 60, 111-276.

Attempt to restore the Statue of Victory to the Senate.

See above, p. 524.

⁴ *J. E.*, 59, 915-1000. The word *Apotheosis* does not here bear the meaning of deification, but of proclamation, the *acknowledgment of divinity*.

concludes his demonstration by attacking *Manichaeism*, which, by denying Christ's humanity also compromises His Divinity (952-1085)'.¹

c) The *Hamartigenia* -, or poem on *the origin of sin* (960 hexameters), attacks Gnostic dualism, especially the Marcionite variety; evil does not come from God but from the devil, who led man into sin; further, fallen man must thus learn to govern himself and choose freely between the principle of life and the master of death. This powerful work is perhaps Prudentius' best from a literary aspect; as regards its doctrine, the realistic descriptions of hell (824-838) and of Paradise (839-858) should be remarked.

2. Symbolical Works : the *Psychomachia* 3. This work is difficult to classify. The subject of which it treats indicates it as a moral treatise; it consists of a description of the *spiritual combat* so forcefully preached by the Fathers, the struggle between virtue and vice.

The author's treatment is inspired much less by the ascetical treatises than by the antique epics. It is at first disconcerting to see his fictitious characters speaking and acting like the heroes of Homer and Virgil, although it is impossible not to admire the poet's real talent in giving so much life, movement and strength to abstract conceptions.

The poem contains 915 hexameters. First, *Faith*: "Prima petit campum, dubia sub sorte duelli, — Pugnatura Fides"; with effortless ease Faith destroys Idolatry (21-39). In her turn, *Modesty* overcomes Voluptuousness, that "ravens she wolf" (40-108), and *Patience* defeats Anger (109-177). Pride is a more redoubtable adversary, but is finally beheaded by *Humility* (178-309). An even greater adversary for the hesitating and modest group of virtues is Sensuality, armed, not with javelins, but with rose leaves; *Sobriety* exhorts them, leads them on, and finally fells the monster (310-572). *Mercy (operatio)* vanquishes Avarice (573-643), and *Concord* routs Heresy (644-888), and victory is thus assured. The epic ends with a hymn to Christ.

Such a work seems strange to our modern taste. It is strange to see all these personified abstractions, which "rail against one another, embrace, and repeat uneasily the words and gestures of the heroes of the Aeneid"; how artificial seems the unquenchable eloquence which pervades these combats, in which "flows a blood too pale to stir emotion"². But the Middle Ages were not so exacting and held the *Psychomachia* in high esteem; its allegorism, excellent in itself, was lavishly imitated by artists, sculptors and painters. The ancients also were fond of this symbolical style; in their *mythology* is often found the deification of abstract realities, and these not always of the best. From this latter point of view Prudentius' slaughter of those vices which had so often

• Si non verus homo est, quem mors hominem probat ipsa,
Nec verus Deus est, operis quem gloria prodit
Esse Deum. v. 1054-1056.

• P. L., 59, 1007-1078. — 3 P. L., 60, 11-90.
4 P. DE LABRIOLLE. *Op. cit.*, p. 619.

been deified is of capital interest, and renders his work, in spite of its shortcomings, extremely instructive, for it reveals the *triumph of the Christian spirit over Paganism*.

3. Liturgical Works. To this class belong the *Cathemerinon* and the *Peristephanon*; to these may also be added the *Dittochaeon*.

The *Cathemerinon* ' should be, as the title indicates (καθημερινών — *hymnorum liber*), a collection of hymns "for every day". In reality, of the 12 hymns it contains, 6 at least are meant for the sanctification of the different hours of the day : hymn at dawn (*ad gallicinium*, 1), in the morning, 2 ; before and after meals, 3 and 4 ; for the hour at which the lamps are lighted, 5 ; lastly, before retiring to sleep, 6. To this cycle may also be added the hymns for fasting, 7 ; for the ninth hour when the fast is broken, 8 ; and the thanksgiving hymn for every hour (*hymnus omni horae*, 9). The last three hymns concern the dead, to, and the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany, 10 and 12. These poems, which as a rule are extremely long², are written in various metres; the iambic dimeter predominates, both catalectic (6) and acatalectic (1, 2, 11, 12). Only the latter, which like those of Saint Ambrose were more popular, have been incorporated in the liturgy. The breviary still contains, together with fragments of the 1st and the 2nd³, the greater part of the 12th, from which are drawn the hymns: *Quicumque Christum quieritis* (Transfiguration), *O sola magnarum urbium* (Epiphany), *Audit tyrannus anxius* and *Salvate fores martyrum* (Holy Innocents). Although all his work did not rise to the pure beauty of these last strophes, Prudentius deserves to be called one of the best representatives of Christian lyric poetry.*

The *Peristephanon* is a collection of 14 hymns on the *Crowns of the Martyrs* (περί στεφάνων) or, in other words, their life and death. Prudentius sang especially of the Spanish martyrs : the deacon Vincent, the martyrs of Saragossa and of Calahorra, Saint Eulalia, etc. The Roman martyrs also had their hymns : Saint Laurence (2nd), Saint Cassian (9th), Saint Hippolytus (nth), Saints Peter and Paul (12th) and Saint Agnes (14th). The poet found his matter in popular tradition; he wrote not as an historian and a critic but as an enthusiastic and pious admirer. In spite of a somewhat too crude realism in the description of the martyrs' torments, and a leaning to declamation, these hymns, some of which are true poems, may be numbered among the best of Prudentius' writings, both on account of their elevated inspiration and their learned and artistic composition⁶.

¹ P. L., 59, 775-914.

² The seventh has 220 verses, and the eighth, which is the shortest, has 80.

³ It is difficult to sustain the lyrical note in such long poems.

⁴ In Tuesday Lauds (*Ates dies nuntius*) the first, Wednesday (*Nox et tenebræ lumina*) second, and Thursday (*Lux ecce surgit aurea*) second.

* It may be mentioned that several of Prudentius' hymns have been translated into verse by Racine and Malherbe.

⁵ L. L., 60, 277-590.

⁶ The poet's skill is revealed in the diversity of metres he employs. See the list in P. de Labriolle, *op. cit.*, p. 608, n. 3.

The *Dittochaeon*' is a collection of 49 quatrains in hexameter-*/* explanatory *inscriptions* placed in churches and under pictures portraying scenes from the Old and the New Testaments, which form the *twofold table* from which the Christian is nourished: hence the title, twofold nourishment (Διττό οχή).

Prudentius at one bound surpassed all the Christian poets who preceded him, and although he did not perhaps achieve perfection — it has been said that he was lacking in a sense of proportion and psychological observation — he at least came very near to it; he is incontestably the greatest poet of the fourth century. He has the true poet's gift of deep feeling, of brilliant colouring; a facility in no wise cramped by technical difficulties, together with a wealth of varied and harmonious expression. On the other hand, his ideas are sound, and, if not original, are at least elevated; he turned his hand to every style almost without effort; lyric, epic and didactic poetry; he even dared to bring theological discussions into his poems, and in spite of the difficulty of the undertaking produced works of real interest. What is especially to be noticed in Prudentius' work is the triumph of *Christian inspiration in art*. This aspect of his work is truly important, for it marks a date in the history of literature.

CHAPTER XIII.

Historians and Chroniclers.

Rufinus.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

1. SULPICIUS SEVERUS'.

Life. Sulpicius Severus, whose work is wholly historical in nature, was one of the most cultivated minds and one of the most elegant writers in prose of his time. Born in

¹ *P. L.*, 60, 89-112.

² Editions: *P. L.*, 20, 95-222. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1866, t. I. French translation, Herbert et Riton, Paris, 1848-1849, 2 vol. Studies: A. Laviell TUJON, *La Chronique*, text, trans, and commentary, Paris, 1896-1899, 2 vol. Deichaye, *Saint Martin et Sulpice-Sh'ère*, in *Anal. Boll.*, 1920, p. 5-136. H. Goelzer, Paris, 1883 (Literary study in Latin).

Aquitania about 360 of a distinguished family, he was given an excellent literary education and became well known as an advocate. He married the daughter of a Consul, but the death of his young wife turned his thoughts to a life of piety and renunciation. Following the advice and example of his friend Paulinus, the future Bishop of Noia, and encouraged by Saint Martin whom he visited on several occasions at Tours, he went to live as a solitary at Primuliacum † in 399. There he spent his time in ascetic exercises and literary work. It is probable that he was ordained priest. Gennadius relates that towards the end of his life he bound himself to observe complete silence as a penance for having adhered at one time to Pelagianism. He died between 420 and 425.

The works of Sulpicius Severus deal with the *general history* of religion, and with the *life of Saint Martin*.

On general religious history he left two books of *Chronicles*², intended for the educated class of Christians. These books, which he finished in 403, contain a synopsis of Jewish history (made according to the books of the Old Testament, analysed in chronological order) and of the history of the Church from the death of the Apostles until the year 400.

The author makes a large use of Eusebius. He was particularly well informed on Priscillianism. His *Chronicle* reveals a fine critical sense, rare enough in his time. His style was modelled on that of the best Roman historians, Sallust and Tacitus. The humanists of the Renaissance had a great esteem for this book, which had been too neglected during the Middle Ages. Scaliger calls its author *ecclesiasticorum purissimus scriptor*.

But Sulpicius Severus acquired his great popularity by his writings on Saint Martin. They comprise: 1) a *Life of Saint Martins*, composed during the saint's lifetime and published in 397; 2) *three letters*⁴ (to Eusebius, Aurelius and Bassula), which form a kind of appendix to the Life, and narrate the manner of Saint Martin's death; 3) lastly, *two dialogues*⁵

¹ It is not certain whether Primuliacum was situated at Vendres or at Saint Sever de Rostan. See F. Mourret, *Sulpice-Sivère à Primuliac*, Paris, 1907. 1. RICAUD, *Sulpice SMre el sa villa de Primuliac à Saint Sever de Pustlau*, Tarbes, 1914. — ² *Chronicorum libri duo* or *Historia Sacra*, P. L., 20, 95-160.

† P. L., 20, 159-176.

« P. L., 20, 175-184.

‡ P. L., 20, 183-222. In reality there are three dialogues, since the first contains two quite distinct parts.

written about 404, in which several of the saint's miracle» are compared with those of the Oriental Christian ascetics. All these writings, which made greater appeal to the people than the Chronicle, had an immense vogue, probably on account of the marvellous and miraculous events which are told on each page. The apparent extravagance of the work has aroused the suspicions of the critics. It has even been supposed that Sulpicius Severus' hero sprang entirely from his own inventive mind, and that the real Saint Martin was no more than an unimportant bishop*. But there is nothing to show that the portrait of the saint and the events narrated are not true in substance. It may be avowed that the author was somewhat credulous at times; but it cannot be admitted that the whole work is no more than a pious novel written by the author with his tongue in his cheek. But Sulpicius Severus "will always remain an interesting and original writer, even should we not attribute to him all those hidden designs with which some have been pleased to make his character more complex" 13

II. PAULUS OROSIUS λ

Life. Paulus Orosius, born about 380(?) in Spain (at Braga or perhaps at Tarragona), was already a priest when his admiration for Saint Augustine caused him to make a voyage to Africa and visit the great bishop. He presented him his relation on Priscillianism (*Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum* 4,414), which induced Augustine to compose a treatise against the same errors. Saint Augustine, for his part, persuaded Orosius to undertake the voyage to Palestine and charged him with two letters to Saint Jerome. Orosius received a friendly welcome from the monk of Bethlehem, whom he helped in his controversy with the Pelagians: he himself at the end of 415 wrote a *Libit apologeticas contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate*^, which was

1 E. Ch. Babut, *Saint Martin de Tours*, Paris, 1912.

* P. de Labriolle, *Hist. lit. lat. chrét.*, p. 516.

3 Editions: P. L., 31, 663-1216. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1882, t. v. Studies: T. DE Moerner, *De Orosii vita & jusque historiarum libris*, Breslau, 1884. E. Mejean, *Paul Orose et son apologetique contre les païens*, Strasbourg, 1862. G. Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, t. II.

4 P. L., 31, 1211-1216 (or 42, 665-670).

5 See chap. xvii, p. 624.

* P. L., 31, 663-1172.

intended to unmask the error of these new heretics, but which had the unfortunate result of causing a split between him and John of Jerusalem, who favoured Pelagius. Soon afterwards he quitted Palestine and was about to enter Spain when he was stopped by rumours of war. He went back to Saint Augustine in Africa, and, encouraged by the bishop, wrote the *Historiarum adversus paganos libri septem* *; in 417-418. After this date nothing further is known of his life or the place and date of his death.

Orosius' History is chiefly an apologetical work. In order to supplement and develop an *idea* already put forward in Saint Augustine's *Civitas Dei*, the author, especially in his third book, endeavours to prove from historical facts that before the coming of Jesus Christ mankind suffered from war, famine and all kinds of evils; hence the barbarian invasion which was threatening the Empire could not be attributed to the disappearance of Paganism and the triumph of Christianity. To prove his assertions he chose the most disastrous episodes from the annals of ancient peoples and arranged them in the framework of an outline of history. Rome occupied the middle place. The work comprised seven books, of which six deal with the periods before Jesus Christ: the first goes as far as the foundation of Rome (which Orosius fixes in 752); the five following books, II-VI, relate simultaneously the history of Rome and of the whole world until the establishment of the Empire. The seventh and last shows the place occupied by Christ in this mass of events and continues the relation of facts until the year 417. For the last forty years of his narration, the author was probably an eye-witness. For the preceding period he must necessarily have had recourse to earlier documents, and the value of his writing is thus lessened from an historical point of view. Further, he was less concerned with criticising his sources than with passing a judgment on the facts they recounted. It was these general and philosophical speculations which won for Orosius' History the popularity it enjoyed in the Middle Ages. In spite of the considerable number of weaker portions it contains, this work is of real interest for its eloquent description of the intervention of Providence in history.

* A L., 31, 663-1172.

III. — RUFINUS³

A). Life of Rufinus. The Origenist Controversy.

Tyrannius Rufinus was born at Concordia, near Aquilea, in 345. His parents were Christians. He received a sound classical education, first at Aquilea and then at Rome, where he made the acquaintance of his countryman, Saint Jerome. On his return to Aquilea he became a monk. Soon Jerome came to join him and they became close friends. Shortly after the latter's departure for the East, about 374, Rufinus followed him in company with Melania the Elder, who went to found a monastery on the Mount of Olives. He interrupted his journey in Egypt where he remained a long time visiting the deserts, and took great interest in the lessons of Didymus. It was not till 378 that he finally arrived in Palestine. He founded a monastery not far from that of Melania, where, together with his monks, he passed his days in pious exercises and the composition of learned works. He seems to have been ordained priest by John of Jerusalem in 390. He was a fervent disciple of Origen, whose work he had learned to appreciate in Egypt, and remained faithful to him when the Origenist quarrel opened in 393. This was the cause of his first split with Jerome, which lasted for four years. They were reconciled in 397.

In the springtime of the same year, Rufinus returned to the West. His imprudent zeal in propagating Origen's writings reopened the Origenist controversy. No sooner was he back than he translated Pamphilus' *Apology for Origen* (Summer 397), and undertook the translation of the *De Principiis*. The first two books of the latter appeared during Lent 398, preceded by a *Preface* in which Rufinus pretended that his work was a continuation of that of Saint Jerome, whose other occupations prevented him from writing it himself. Jerome's friends in Rome regarded this declaration as a hypocritical and sly attempt on Rufinus' part to compromise Jerome⁵. But these were rash judgments³; there is nothing to justify them in the text, and it is easy to understand why, in the Preface to Books in and iv which

• Editions: P. L., 21, and in the works of the authors he translated. Studies: F. Ca VALLERA, *Saint Jérôme*, chiefly t. I, p. 193-286 and t. II, diverse notes, p. 97-101 (Rufinus' accuracy), 115-127 (Saint Jerome and Origen), and 131-135 (Rufinus and Saint Jerome after the Origenist controversy). J. BROCHET, *Saint Jérôme et ses ennemis*, Paris (too severe on Rufinus). See Bardenhewei; *Geschichte*, II, 549-558.

⁵ Letter from Pammachius and Oceanus to Saint Jerome: *Ep.* 83 (*op. I/ierJJ*

³ See F. Ca v a l l e r à, *op. cit.*, p. 240 sq.

appeared during the Summer of 398, Rufinus had already begun to protest against these spiteful insinuations.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the translator had been extraordinarily imprudent. Knowing how susceptible was his friend in all that concerned his literary works, and still more his orthodoxy, he should have refrained from dragging him into his own undertakings. Furthermore, since Origen's orthodoxy was already in doubt he should have thought twice before continuing to spread his writings. It is true that he corrected the *De Principiis*, but many errors remained, notably as regards the last ends. In reality these works were destined to strengthen in the West that vague and doubtful eschatology which we find in various spheres both in Rome and Milan. That was an obvious danger, but it was not remarked by Rufinus. He felt himself firmly anchored in faith and tradition, and thought, perhaps, that such principles would also suffice for others as an offset to the excesses of the great Alexandrian. For this he may, to some extent, be excused. In any case there exist no serious grounds for doubting his good faith, and it would be unjust to consider him as a heretic and a propagator of heresy, seeking to spread new doctrines under cover of the authority of a third party, in the present instance, Saint Jerome. At this time there was no Origenist sect as such, although Origenist errors were abroad, which in some cases were regarded too lightly. Saint Jerome was especially exacting in this respect, which explains the violent attitude he adopted in this quarrel.

In reality the entire controversy was due to a misunderstanding for which Saint Jerome's Roman friends were responsible. They had no real grounds for their *suspicious* and were wrong in imparting them to the irascible solitary. There was nothing that could have been more imprudent. Rufinus' motives were misrepresented, and Jerome must have thought that his friend, to whom he had been reconciled with so much difficulty, had again betrayed him and stooped to a mean and sly trick in order to discredit him. Nothing was more calculated to hurt him, for though hasty, he was also imbued with a deep sense of honour. The break soon became complete and henceforth became irreparable.

On receiving the first Preface of the *De principiis* and the letter from his Roman friends, Saint Jerome wrote Rufinus a letter (399) containing explicit and severe reservations, but which was still fairly friendly in tone¹. This letter was not passed on to Rufinus² by Jerome's *Roman intermediaries*, but another letter, written at the same time in a more querulous tone³, was made public; here Jerome accuses Rufinus of heresy, lying and perjury, and defends himself against the charge of admitting Origen's errors. Angered and hurt, Rufinus resolved to reply and to remind Jerome that he himself had shown that Origen could be read with profit.

Begun in the Springtime of 399, this Apology, which comprises two books, was not finished until 401. Meanwhile Rufinus had justified himself in a letter to Pope Anastasius, to whom he had been denounced; this writing, entitled *Apologia ad Anastasium*⁴, was added as a supple-

¹ *Efi.* 81. See F. CaVALLERA, *op. cit.*, p. 249-251.

F. CaVALLERA, *op. cit.*, p. 254. — ³ *Ep.* 84 (to Pammachius...).

^{*} */. I...* 21, 623-628.

ment to the longer Apology'. In the latter, Rufinus was not content only with defending himself; he also attacked, and charged his adversary with having praised Origen unreservedly many times in the past, and declared that he should therefore show himself more indulgent for others. The author had taken his time in drawing up this apology; he had had careful recourse to the documents and, as F. Cavallera remarks, "wherever it is possible to control his affirmations we find that the verdict must be in favour of Rufinus"'. Although it was not very brilliant, Rufinus' Apologia was sound and revealed real talent. Saint Jerome thrust back (401-402) with unheard of violence. But Rufinus was wise enough to follow the prudent advice he received; he refrained from public reply and thus spared the world the unhappy spectacle of two monks tearing each other to pieces to the amazement of the faithful.

Rufinus does not appear to have lost much public esteem during his lifetime from the lusty blows showered on him by his redoubtable adversary. He lived for ten more years, honoured by the friendship of distinguished men, such as Saint Paulinus of Noia, and showed himself worthy of such friendship by a laborious and virtuous life. During this time he composed a number of original works, but busied himself especially with translations. When Italy was invaded by the Visigoths in 410 he went to Sicily with Melania the Younger and Pinianus, where he died in 411.

"The veneration in which he was held by his contemporaries, and of which an echo is still to be found in the *Gelasianum*, was gradually destroyed under the influence of Saint Jerome's writings. These earned for him a loss of esteem which has ever since blackened his memory"⁴. But this disgrace into which he has fallen is unmerited. He was not perhaps a genius, and unlike Saint Jerome did not make up for his lack of really original ideas by brilliance of style. But he never prided himself on his talents, and for the most part was content to be a *translator*. Even from this point of view he has been reproached with translating too freely, either with deliberate intention or through failing to seize all the shades of meaning. In spite of these shortcomings, however, his work has proved useful in the extreme. Cavallera remarks: "he has not been fully appreciated. In reality he was one of the most active workers in the field of Christian letters, and his laborious work of translation,

¹ *P. L.*, 21, 541-624. See F. Cavallera, *Op. cit.*, p. 264-269.

² *Op. cit.*, II, p. 101.

³ "Rufinus, vir religiosissimus", says this document.

⁴ F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, I, p. 282.

although only second-rate, has nevertheless been extremely useful to the Latin world !

B). Works of Rufinus.

These fall under two heads : *personal compositions* and *translations*.

Among the really personal works, in addition to his letters of spiritual direction (lost) and the two *Apologies* (already mentioned'), the following should be noticed :

1) The *Commentary on the Apostle? Creed*³, a highly esteemed writing which dates from 404, and in which is found the first complete and reliable Latin text of the Roman Creed⁴ and a complete canon of the Scriptures⁵;

2) a treatise on the *Blessings of the Patriarchs*⁶, in two books, written in 406-407 at the request of Saint Paulinus of Noia, which explains, according to the threefold sense, historical, moral and mystical, the blessing of Jacob and his twelve sons (*Gen.*, x l ix);

3) lastly, his *Ecclesiastical History*" (402-403). This work comprises the two books which he added to Eusebius' History and in which are related the events which took place from 324 until 395, the date of Theodosius' death. This work, which is valuable in spite of the author's insufficient documentation", has for its chief title to glory that of being the first of its kind to be written in the West. Sulpicius Severus' work, which was composed shortly after this period, easily surpasses it in soundness and precision, as well as in style. Rufinus' original historical work consists of these two books alone; but he was responsible for the widespread dissemination in the West of Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* by means of a revised translation (9 books instead of 10) which dates from 403. Towards the end of his life (404-410) he also brought out a *History of the Egyptian Monks*, which was for a long time supposed to be his own work, but which in reality is also a translation'.

the chief Christian works translated¹⁰ by Rufinus, in addition to the two above mentioned, are the writings of *Saint Basil* (the 2 Rules, in 397, and 8 discourses, in 399-400), of *Saint Gregory of Nazianzus* (9 discourses, 399-400), of *Evagrius Ponticus* (diverse collections of sayings, about 400 and previously), of the *Pseudo Clement* (Recognitions and Letter from Clement to James, 405), of *Pamphilus* (Apology for Irgen, 398, which he supplemented by an appendix treating of the misrepresentations of Origen's works), and lastly and more especially ¹¹ Origen himself, for whom he had special veneration and whom he desired to make known in the West. He began in 398 with the

' *Ibid.*, p. 282, n. i.

Apologia ad Anastasium, P. L., 21, 623-628; *Apologia in sanet. Hieronymum*, F. L., 21, 541-624.

' P. L., 21, 335-386. — 4 See above, p. 39. — s *Expos. in symb.*, n. 36-38.

' P. L., 21, 297-336. — ? P. L., 21, 467-540.

It would seem that Rufinus follows Gelasius of Caesarea very closely. See above, p. 495. — 9 See above, p. 501.

For the text of the translations, see the author translated.

Alexandrian masters great theological work, the *De Principiis* or *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, of which he translated the four books, correcting at the same time the Trinitarian errors which would have offended Roman ears. Rufinus also translated Origen's Commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans* (in part) in 404; the Commentary on the *Cantic of Canticles* (in part) in 410; and nearly 120 *homilies* at various times. He also translated, with greater exactness than was his wont, the *De Recta in Deum fide* which he mistakenly attributed to Origen.

Rufinus' doctrinal influence, which was partly bound up with the diffusion of Origenism, was not fortunate as regards Eschatology. Saint Ambrose and Saint Jerome had both been influenced in some measure by the Alexandrian Doctor, but Rufinus spread his teaching indiscriminately. Although he corrected the Trinitarian errors of the *De Principiis*, he retained and even aggravated other and no less doubtful doctrines. This is especially the case as regards "Origen's solutions of the problems of the fall of the angels and of souls, the inequality of present conditions, the manner of the resurrection, the length of the pains of hell and the final restoration of all reasonable beings in the happiness and friendship of God. These solutions, whether Rufinus willed it or not, won many partisans even in Rome. Many were seduced: priests, monks and especially laymen. The justice of God was called in question... women were heard to... affirm that they would then be (at the resurrection) like angels. Saint Jerome, who gives these details, says elsewhere that the greater number probably interpreters — saw in the penitent Nabuchodonosor, the devil converted and restored to his old place at the end of the world; that the majority understood in a metaphorical sense what is said in the Scriptures of the worm which dies not and the fire which is not extinguished. And as for the universality of salvation, Saint Augustine tells us how numerous were the opinions — all exaggerated — which were current among the faithful about 420"³. It would be wrong to throw all the responsibility for these excesses on Rufinus. Long before, Saint Ambrose had admitted and spread these same opinions. But Rufinus, far from taking up his stand against them, continued, at least indirectly, to spread them. Moreover,

* See above for the controversy which resulted from this translation.

- See above, p. 289.

³J. Tixeront, *Hist. Degni.*, π, p. 334-335. This author enumerates six different opinions, all tending to reduce the length of the pains of hell or to augment the number of the saved.

theology had not yet said the last word in these matters. Pope Anastasius' condemnation of the gravest of these "Origenist" doctrines¹ failed to put an end to rash speculation, and Saint Jerome himself was not above reproach a.

It is clear that Rufinus' doctrinal influence should not be reduced to this question alone. Although his translations were not the expression of his own ideas they had considerable effect, and exercised a good influence on the whole, especially from an ascetic and mystical point of view. The numerous Oriental works, both homilies and commentaries, which he made known in the West, were really worthy of being placed in the hands of Latin readers, who for a long time had no other source than Rufinus. It is on account of these services that, although the critic still retains his right to be severe, the historian must show himself indulgent.

IV. DIVERS HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

A). Accounts of Pilgrimages.

Two writings dating from the ivth century may be classed under this head.

1. The *Itinerarium burdigalense* is really less an account of a pilgrimage than a simple traveller's diary, so concise as to be boring in the extreme, were it not rendered interesting by its precise details, the "pilgrim of Bordeaux" first travels to Constantinople, where he arrives in May 333; he continues his journey as far as Palestine, visits the Holy Land, and returns to Gaul by way of Rome and Milan².

2. The *Peregrinatio ad loca sanota*, discovered in 1884 by Garnurini, was edited by him in 1887, under the title 5. *Silvia Aquit. Peregrinatio*'. The author, however, was not Saint Silvia, the sister of Rufinus of Aquitania, as was at first thought, but probably a great Spanish lady³, a nun in Gaul, whose name has not yet been determined⁶. About 395 this *Pseudo Silvia* made a journey which lasted about three years; she visited in turn Palestine, the Sinaitic peninsula, Egypt, and Upper Syria as far as Edessa. When she arrived in Constantinople on her way home she sent to her sisters the relation (which is now partly extant; the beginning and the end are missing) of all she had seen and particularly observed. Her extremely circumstantial account, written in a simple and popular style, is very valuable. The detailed list which

¹ See above, p. 516, n. 7. — ² See ch. xtv, p. 589.

³ P. L., 8, 783 sq. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1898, t. XXXIX, p. I-33.

⁴ J. F. Gamurrini, *Hilarii tractatus... et S. Silvia...*, Rome, 1887. *Corpus* vienna, *ibid*.

See Dom M. Ferotin, in *Kev. Quest. Hist.*, t. i. xxtv (1903), p. 367-397.

⁵ Dom Ferotin calls hers *Etheria*. Other authors have proposed *Eucheria*, *Egeria*, etc. For the present she may be called *Pseudo-Silvia*.

contains the liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem, described chiefly on the occasion of the solemnities of Holy Week and Easter Week, is of capital interest for the history of liturgical institutions

B). The Chronographer of the year 354 a.

Such is the name given to the anonymous author of a valuable compilation of ten historical documents, certain of which are of the highest importance. The only link which binds them is the date according to which they have been arranged. The following is the list of these documents :

1. Official calendar of the town of Rome, written in 354 by Philocalus.
2. Consular annals of Rome until 354.
3. Paschal tables from 312 to 411.
4. List of the Prefects of Rome from 254 to 354.
5. Dates of the deaths and burials of the Popes (*depositiones episcoporum Rom.*) from S. Lucius (d. 254) until Saint Julius I (d. 352).
6. Anniversaries of the martyrs honoured at Rome (*depositiones martyrum*); this is the earliest known martyrology.
7. The so-called *Liberian Catalogue*, or list of Popes from Saint Peter until Liberius (352-366); in the sixth century this document was used by the author of the *Liber Pontificalis* for the early part of his work.
8. A description of the City of Rome by districts, about 334.
9. A *Chronicle of the World* (sometimes called *Chronica Horosii*) extending as far as 334 (this is a revision or supplement to Hippolytus' chronicle).
10. Chronicle of Rome as far as 324.

Documents 5, 6, 7 are particularly important as regards the history of the Church.

C). Other Chronographical Works.

1. Hilarianns, an obscure African of the end of the fourth century, wrote in 397 :

a) *De ratione pascha et mensis*;

b) *De cursu temporum*.

These works are of little value.

2. The so-called Hieronymian. Martyrology is of greatest interest. It has no connection with the monk of Bethlehem. It consists of a compilation made in Northern Italy in the fifth century, combining "three principal documents : 1. a Greek Martyrology, probably drawn up at

1 Dom F. Cabrol, *Elude sur la Peregrinatio Silvia. Les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^e siècle*, Paris, 1895. J. Thibaut, *Ordre des offices de la Sent. Sainte à Jérusalem, du IV^e au X^e s.*, Paris, 1926. See also Mgr Duchesne, *Les origines du culte chrétien*. For this writing as a whole, see H. Leclercq, *Etheria*, in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 552-584.

• See O. Bardenheuer, *Geschichte*, in, p. 558-560.

3 See L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, I, Introduction, p. VI sq.

Nicomedia about the middle of the fourth century; 2. a Roman calendar, which stops in this particular version about the year 422, but which is notably much earlier than this date; 3. an African calendar also dating from the fourth century". The *Hieronymian Martyrology* is now extant only in two Gallican versions, in each of which the primitive text has suffered modifications. Efforts are being made to reconstitute the original text.

CHAPTER XIV.

Saint Jerome.

Special bibliography.

Editions: P. L., 22-30 (D. Vallarsi's edit Verona, 1734-1742). *Corpus* of Vienna, t. Liv, lv and LVI (1910, 1912, 1918), Letters, t. LVII (1913), *Jerem.* DOM G. Morin, *Anecdota Maredsolana*, t. III, three parts, Maredsous, Oxford, 1895, 1897, 1903 (short commentaries and sermons). French trans., B. DE MATOUGUES, *Œuvres de S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1858 (copious extracts).

Studies: J. FORGET, *Jérôme (saint)*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 894-983. Lives: in addition to Stilling (*Acta Sanctorum*, Sept, vili, p. 418 sq.), Tillemont (*Mémoires*, xii, 1717), Largent, *Saint Jérôme* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1898. F. CAVALLERA, *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son œuvre*, 1st part (Life) in 2 vol., Paris-Louvain, 1922; (the second part will consist of a doctrinal and literary study). E. BERNARD, *Les voyages de S. Jérôme* (thesis), biography, Paris, 1864. MARTIN, *The Life of Saint Jerome*, London, 1889. A. THIERRY, *Saint Jérôme, la société chrétienne...* Paris, 1851, 2 vol. (out of date). G. GRUTZMACHER, Protestant, *Hieronymus* (critical biography), 3 vols., Leipzig-Berlin, 1901-1906, 1908. J. BROCHET, *Saint Jérôme et ses ennemis*, Paris, 1915 (somewhat misleading; see F. CAVALLERA, *op. cit.*, n, p. 149). DOM L. SANDERS, *Etudes sur S. Jérôme* (his teaching on inspiration and the canon of the Scriptures, the episcopacy, Origenism), Brussels-Paris, 1903. H. GOELZER, *Etude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1884. E. BOUVY, studies in the *Rev. augustinienne*, t. I (1902), on S. Jerome's style; t. II and III (1903, on Saint Jerome at Constantinople, 6 articles). M. J. LAGRANGE, *S. Jérôme et S. Augustin, à propos des origines de la Vulgate*, in *Mélanges d'hist. rei.*, Paris, 1915, p. 167-185. A. VACCARI, *S. Girolamo, Studi e Schizzi*, Rome, 1921. *Miscellanea Geronimiana*, Rome, 1920 (various studies, written for St. Jerome's xvth centenary by many scholars).

¹ L. DUCHESNE, in *Miscellanea Geronimiana*, Rome, 1920, p. 223. See *ibid.*, p. 219-226.

I. LIFE AND CHARACTER.

Saint Jerome's long life may be divided into two almost equal parts¹: the first (347-385), which was fairly active, was chiefly a period of *formation* and *preparation*; the second (385-419), more sedentary, corresponded with his life at *Bethlehem* and *Xws. great works* on the Scriptures.

A). Preparation.

Saint Jerome was born at Stridón, on the borders of Pannonia and Dalmatia², about 347, of wealthy and Christian parents, who when he was about twelve years old sent him to Rome to finish his literary studies³. He took a passionate interest in the Greek and Latin classics, philosophers and poets; Virgil especially captivated him. So desirous was he of learning, that he formed a little personal library by copying out entire books in his own hand. Unhappily, study did not prove for him an effective safeguard against the passions of youth; he let himself drift for some time, but he never lost his faith, and his conscience finally brought him back to the right path. Before leaving Rome, he was baptised by Pope Liberius about 365. After a short stay at *Trier*, where he began to study theology and made up his mind to become a monk, he came to Aquilea. He remained in this town for six or seven years (368-374), either as a monk or at least in close contact with monks; he frequented a circle of the younger clergy wholly given up to study and pious exercises. Among these was Rufinus, whose acquaintance he had made in Rome. These years marked the beginning of a close friendship between the two scholars.

Owing to a disagreement with his family⁴, he decided to make a voyage to the East about 374. By way of Greece, Thracia and Asia Minor he came to *Antioch*, where he was welcomed by his friend, Evagrius, great lord, priest, and

¹ The *dates* *à* Saint Jerome's life are still under discussion, notably those of his birth and death. In this chapter we will keep to those given by F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, t. II, *Chronologie de S. Jérôme*, p. 3-63.

² On S. Jerome's birthplace, see a *note* by F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 67-71.

³ He probably studied grammar from 359 to 363, and the humanities and philosophy from 363 to 367.

⁴ It would appear that he fell out with his family on account of the spiritual influence he exercised over his younger sister, whom he tried to persuade to take the veil. It was to avoid the hissing of an "Iberian viper" (chiefly an allusion to his aunt, Castorina) that he went away so abruptly.

future successor of Paulinus. Soon after this, he conceived the desire of a more perfect life and withdrew to the east of Antioch to the desert of *Chalcis*, "that Syrian Thebaid", where in order to overcome his fiery passions and obtain peace of soul he practised frightful austerities. It was at this time that he made a thorough study of Greek. He also learned Hebrew, not without difficulty. He was divinely inspired¹ to give up reading Pagan authors, and resolved that henceforth he would study only the Scriptures². Having been accused of Sabellianism by the Oriental monks because of the expression *τρία πρόσωπα* which he used instead of *τρὴν ὑποστάσει*, he wrote to Pope Damasus to know which of the two formulas was the better³, and shortly afterwards quitted the desert and returned to *Antioch*, where he lived for some time (377?-379?). It was about this time that, after some opposition, he allowed himself to be ordained priest by Paulinus (about 378), on condition that he was not attached to any particular Church. It must have been also during this period that he followed Apollinaris' lessons in exegesis⁴ and began to communicate with the Jews of Beroea s. Attracted by Saint Gregory of Nazianzus' reputation, he then went to *Constantinople* (379), where for two years he was able to take advantage of the teaching of this unrivalled master. During the Council, he also made the acquaintance of Saint Gregory of Nyssa. It was then that he made his first translations and tried his hand at exegesis⁶. In 382 he went to Rome in company with Paulinus of Antioch and Saint Epiphanius; only the interests of the Church (*necessitas ecclesiastica*)⁷ was capable of bringing him back to the centre of unity.

¹ He was scourged in a dream on account of his exaggerated love for profane writers, and resolved to read them no more. *Ep.* 22, n. 30. See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, It, p. 77-78. This author places this incident at Antioch during Jerome's first stay in that town.

² A no longer extant commentary on Abdias was his first attempt at exegesis.

³ *Ep.* 15. This letter, which contains precious witness to the Roman Primacy, is also "a first-class psychological document". F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, I, p. 52.

⁴ Formerly this incident was supposed to have taken place during his first stay at Antioch. F. Cavallera gives good reasons for the change of date.

⁵ These were the Nazarenes, who sent him their Gospel in Hebrew, which he translated. It must have been about this time that he refuted the Luciferians and wrote the life of Saint Paul the Hermit. (See *works*).

⁶ Letter 18 (*De seraphim et de calculo*), on the vision of Isaias, is his first known commentary. Another treatise, edited in 1901 by Amelli (*Anecdota d'Amelli*), is a translation from Jerome, and is probably of much later date: its author was a violent Anti-Origenist. See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 81-86.

⁷ *Ep.* 127, n. 7.

This second visit to Rome was relatively short (382-385), but of the greatest importance for Jerome, for it was these years, as Tixeront says, that shaped his future. His reputation as a scholar had gone before him. Pope Damasus took him as his secretary, and he was generally pointed out as the successor of that Pope. Among the undertakings that Damasus asked of his collaborator was that of establishing an official text of the early Latin version then in use in the West, and to put an end to the great variety of texts which were then current. This work, begun in 384, soon led to others which took up nearly the whole of Saint Jerome's lifetime. His passion for study, which till then had been somewhat haphazard, had henceforth a definite object. The treasures of knowledge which he had accumulated in so many diverse forms during his long apprenticeship were destined to be used in the fullest way for the general good of the Church; and so that nothing should hinder him from his task, Divine Providence was soon to furnish him the means of devoting himself wholly to its achievement.

Public opinion in Rome, which at first had been so favourable to the learned ascetic, was not long in suffering a change. The causes were the audacity of his Scriptural criticism and still more perhaps the unmoderated language he employed in blaming the conduct of lukewarm Christians and relaxed clergy. Criticism and malevolent insinuation increased from day to day. It went as far as to speak evilly of his relations with a circle of noble matrons, as renowned for their virtue as for their birth, whom Jerome was directing in the way of renunciation and sacred learning, and whom he was teaching to read the Bible in the original Greek and Hebrew. This study circle usually met in the house of *Marcella*, who with her mother, *Albina*, and the virgin, *Asella*, lived on the Aventine. The most outstanding of this group were *Paula* and her two daughters, *Blesilla* and *Eustochium*¹. While Damasus still lived this opposition remained within bounds. After the election of Pope Siricius, less intimate with Saint Jerome, it broke out angrily, and Saint Jerome, although conscious of his innocence, made up his mind to leave Rome². He left in 385 with the determination of living

¹ See F. Cavallera, «*l. cit.*, I, p. 84-113.

² *Ep.* 45. See *ibid.*, I, p. 113-120; π, p. 86-88 (Note on the circumstance attendant on his departure from Rome).

ni Palestine. Paula, not wishing to be deprived of the lessons of such a master, followed him there with Eustochium, and founded a monastery of religious women.

B). The Solitary of Bethlehem. Works and Controversies.

I. Before settling down permanently in any place in Palestine, Jerome decided to visit all the Holy Places as a pilgrim and a scholar. After their landing at Antioch, the group of friends who accompanied him (his brother, Paulinianus, the priest Vincent and a few monks), who were then joined by Paula with Eustochium and other few religious women, followed the coast of Syria and Palestine, by way of Ptolémaïs Caesarea, Diospolis, Joppa (Jaffa), went up to Jerusalem though Nicopolis, and finally came to Bethlehem. Jerome continued his pious exploration as far as Galilee and then to Egypt, where he desired to see Nitria; there he came into contact with Didymus, with whom he struck up a close friendship and with whom he discussed his doubts on the Scriptures'. This visit to Alexandria was broken off after a month by the heats of 386, which forced the caravan to take the road back to Palestine. It was then that the installation at Bethlehem took place. Paula built two monasteries, one near the grotto and the basilica, for the women¹, and the other for the men at a certain distance from the church²; the latter was not completed until 389. Here Saint Jerome was to pass the rest of his life, surrounded by monks, whose superior and spiritual father he was, and always ready to give hospitality in his guest house to the pilgrims who came to pray in the Holy Places.

The thirty-five years that Saint Jerome spent in Palestine were extraordinarily fertile in literary labours. From a Scriptural point of view, he achieved the revised texts he had begun in Rome, and about 390 commenced that immortal translation of the Bible, finished about 405, which after two centuries of ups and downs ended by taking first place in the West. In the thirteenth century it was given the name of *Vulgate*⁴, which had previously been borne by the early

¹ See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 127-130 (Note on Didymus and Saint Jerome).

This monastery contained three parts corresponding to the three classes of religious women, living in groups according to their rank, but all subjected to the same rule. F. CAVALLERA, *op. cit.*, I, p. 128.

² This monastery is no longer standing, but the memory of Saint Jerome is connected with a grotto near that of the Nativity.

³ It is thought that he began his translation with Samuel and Kings on account of the famous prologue to these books, which is termed the *Prologus galeatus* after Saint Jerome's own expression: "Hic prologus scripturarum, quasi *galeatum principium* omnibus libris quos de Hebraeo vertimus in Latinum, convenire potest". P. L., 28, 555. Cavallera, however, is of the opinion that the prophetic books were the first to be translated. *Op. cit.*, I, p. 147; II, p. 28-29.

version. To carry out this work, he found it necessary, at great expense, to form a library and to procure the texts, notably copies of the Hexapla still preserved at Caesarea. He also took lessons in Hebrew and Aramaean, for which he paid huge sums to rabbis who came to him under the cloak of night. At the same time he brought out various commentaries on the Old and the New Testament, in particular a double series on the Minor Prophets from 391 to 406, and on the Great Prophets from 407 to 420. To these must be added, in addition to Jerome's own homilies to his monks,¹ new translations of Origen's homilies. But although the Scriptures were the chief object of his studies, they did not constitute the only one; a number of *other works*, historical, dogmatic and controversial, both original and translated writings, also date from this period. Lastly, his correspondence, which grew more and more voluminous, led him to treat of the most obscure subjects and some of his letters on theology or exegesis are veritable scholarly dissertations. It is easy to understand why Sulpicius Severus was thus able to describe this tenacious application to work: "He is constantly immersed in study, wholly² plunged in his books, he gives himself no rest either night or day; he is incessantly occupied in reading or writing"³

2. But for the space of nearly twelve years (393-404) the Origenist quarrel came to disturb this studious retirement, and to take up a large place in what have been called "the tribulations of Saint Jerome"⁴. At the outset Jerome had shared the *enthusiasm* of nearly all his Eastern contemporaries for Origen, as witness the many translations he made of the latter's homilies *before* he went to Bethlehem (about 380 at Constantinople, 9 homilies on Isaías, 14 on Jeremías, 14 on Ezechiel; about 383 at Rome, 2 homilies on the Cantic of Canticles), and even *at the beginning* of his residence in Palestine (about 389, 39 homilies on Saint Luke); witness again his praise of Origen every time he had occasion to speak of him⁵, even in the *De viris illustribus*, 393. But the arrival at Jerusalem of the monk, Asterius (393) and, still more, that of Saint Epiphanius (394), threw a hard light on

¹ A certain number of these have recently been published. See p. 58.

² Sulpicius-Severus, *Dial.*, I, 9.

³ F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, I, ii, p. 103-115. See *ibid.*, I, p. 193-286.

⁴ *Ibid.*, π, p. 115-121.

the question of Origen's orthodoxy'. John of Jerusalem remained faithful to him in spite of those who denounced him. Rufinus also remained constant. Jerome allowed himself to be won over by Epiphanius and withdrew from communion with his bishop. The latter tried in vain to get Jerome expelled from Palestine². Relations remained very strained for several years between Bethlehem and Jerusalem³, as well as with the Mount of Olives. In 397 the bishop and Rufinus were reconciled, thanks to the official intervention of Theophilus of Alexandria, but as far as Origenism was concerned each retained his first position.

Meanwhile, Rufinus quitted the East, and hardly had he got to Rome when he published successively a translation of Pamphilus' "Apology for Origen" and another of the "De principiis". The latter was preceded by a preface which was judged to be biased and gave rise to further controversy⁴. Jerome, in the East, at first made a simple reply by giving in 399 a complete translation of the *De Principiis* in which were laid bare the author's errors. Soon, at the suggestion of Theophilus of Alexandria, Pope Anastasius I promulgated a decree (of which the text is lost) against Origen's doubtful doctrines (400) and twice invited the Bishop of Milan to associate himself with the condemnation⁶. Meanwhile, Jerome in the East was taking an increasingly active part in the fight against Origenism, together with Theophilus of Alexandria, whose Paschal letters on this subject he translated at a later date (letters of 401, 402, 404)', and even in 406 a pamphlet against Saint John Chrysostom⁸. But the most important writing of the whole controversy was undoubtedly the famous *Apology against Rufinus*.

It was not until 401 that the priest of Aquileia terminated his own "Apology", begun in 399, in which he was not content only with defending himself against the charge of heresy and duplicity, but in which he also underlined a number of features in the life and writings of Jerome which wounded him deeply: his early commerce with Origen, not forgetting his relations with the Rabbis from whom he learned Hebrew, and the reading of Pagan authors which he continued in spite of his resolves. Immediately Saint Jerome heard the contents of this writing,

¹ See above, p. 396. The controversy was embittered by the attitude taken up in Saint Epiphanius, especially his ordination of Paulinian and the letter he wrote to John of Jerusalem (translated by Saint Jerome, *Ep.* 51).

The death of the minister Rufinus (Nov. 395) suspended the execution of the decree which had already been promulgated at Constantinople.

In 396, when a letter which John of Jerusalem wrote in his defence to Theophilus of Alexandria, and which bore the title of *Exposition* or *Apology*, was published, Saint Jerome wrote against him the *Contra Joannem hierosolymitanum* in which he also inveighed violently against Origen.

² See above, p. 562-563.

In addition to the above mentioned letters, p. 563.

³ See above, p. 516. —⁷ *Ep.* 96, 98, too.

⁴ See letters, 113, 114. F. Cavailler, *op. cit.*, I, 286; II, 43.

⁵ See the abstract in F. Cavailler, *op. cit.*, p. 264-269.

without waiting for the actual text, he set himself to refute it, together with the "Apology to Anastasius". Such is the matter of the first *two* books of Jerome's Apology, written at the end of 401. This answer was extremely sharp in tone. Rufinus was wise enough to make no public reply. He sent to Jerome, together with the text of his Apology, a private letter which Jerome declares to be full of bitter reproaches and even threats of legal action. Whatever it may have contained (the letter is lost), it was in the frame of mind occasioned by this letter that Saint Jerome wrote the third book of his Apology: *Ultima responsio adversus scripta Rufini* (402)-. It may be guessed to what lengths his anger carried him. Never was his talent as a controversialist employed with such animation and eloquence; and never, must it be avowed, did he plead so unworthy a cause. No doubt Rufinus could have defended himself with eminent dignity by omitting to attack his touchy adversary; but in reality truth was on his side, and the shrewdness of his thrusts was thereby increased³. Too often Jerome warded them off only by having recourse to feeble argument, quibbles, epithets and insults: in the long run unfortunately the literary quality of these brilliant invectives obscured the weakness of his case and did untold harm to Rufinus' reputation.

The attitude which was taken by Jerome can only be explained by his strong love for traditional faith and *his pride in his reputation for orthodoxy*. In the midst of the work he had undertaken, and the responsibility that was his, the preservation of the latter was his first duty. He was well aware of it. Hence his fears and distrustful susceptibility, which was unhappily aggravated by the insinuations and misleading reports he received from his friends in Rome and Italy.* They, in great measure, must bear the responsibility of this miserable controversy, which astounded the faithful and sickened so many of the saints.

3. As a rule Saint Jerome made better use of his marvellous controversial gifts, and many were the controversies in which he took part both before and after the Origenist quarrel.

a) During his first stay at Antioch, about 378, he refuted the *Luciferian* schismatics in a short dialogue in two parts

* See *ibid.*, p. 273-279.

0 *Ibid.*, p. 280-282.

3 See above, p. 564.

* See F. Cavaliera, regarding the conduct of Eusebius of Cremona, of whom Rufinus complained on several occasions. *Op. cit.*, p. 255 sq.

§ Saint Augustine wrote to Saint Jerome: "Alas! why cannot I meet you both together! Perhaps in my emotion, my sorrow, my fears, I would fall at your feet, I would weep from the bottom of my heart, I would beg you with all the force of my love, sometimes each of you for himself, sometimes both for each and for the others, especially for the weak for whom Christ died and who will find you in the theatre of this life with great risk of scandal to themselves, not to write publicly those things which you will find impossible to efface once you are reconciled, or which, should you be now reconciled, you fear to read lest you quarrel again". *Ep.* 73 (or no), 8. *P. L.*, 33, 249.

maintaining interesting details on the Church, the hierarchy and the Sacraments.*

6) During his years in Rome, in 383, he attacked *Helvidius*, a poorly educated layman and disciple of Auxentius, the Arian Bishop of Milan, who had dared to write in a treatise that after the birth of Our Lord, Mary had other children, and moreover that marriage is not an inferior state to that of virginity. The sound and finely turned refutation does great credit to the author, who proves, chiefly by the Scriptures, the perpetual virginity of Mary and the excellence of virginity in general.²

c) Shortly afterwards (393), Jerome again made himself the champion of continence against the monk *Jovinianus* and at the same time defended the very foundations of Christian morality, which was being undermined by this reformer, who preached the doctrine of salvation by faith without works.³

f) In 404 he denounced another remote forerunner of Protestantism. This was the Gallic priest, *Vigiliantius*, who received a friendly welcome from Jerome at Bethlehem and who returned this hospitality by disparaging religious life and various external manifestations of worship, notably the veneration of the saints. This unfortunate man was utterly put to route in a treatise written in 406, and thereafter held his peace in his parish in Barcelona.⁴

Saint Jerome's relations with Saint Augustine, which also began in an atmosphere of storm, ended happily in peace and friendliness.⁵ Already in 394 Saint Augustine wrote a letter to Jerome (71/1. 56) in which «) he suggested that he should concentrate on the translation of Oriental exegetes rather than on that of the Bible, since a revised

* See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 56-58. Other critics (Batiffol, Bardenhewer) prefer to date this writing from Rome, 382.

Ibid., p. 93-100. — 3 *Ibid.*, p. 151-164. — * *Ep.*, 104.

F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, p. 306-307.

Saint Jerome's correspondence with Saint Augustine comprises 18 letters, 9 from each. In the edition of Saint Jerome's works they are as follows. P. 22, letters 56, 67; 101, 104, 116; 131, 132 from *Augustine*, and letters 102, 103, 105, 112, 115; 134, 141, 142, 143 from *Jerome*. All these letters may also be found in Saint Augustine's works, P. I., 33, numbered as follows, and corresponding to the above order: *Augustine*, 28, 40; 71, 73, 74, 82; 166, 167; *Jerome*, 68, 39, 72, 75, 81; 172, 195, 123, 202. In this chapter they will be quoted according to Saint Jerome's works. As for the dates, it should be remarked that Augustine's letters are thus classified; the first two belong to the years 394 and 397 or 399; five to 402-405; the last two, » 415-419.

version of the Septuagint was all that was necessary; *b*) he criticised the interpretation given to the Antiochian episode in the commentary *In Ep ad Galatas*¹. Neither this letter nor the following (about 397-399, *Ep.* 67), which contained similar suggestions, reached Jerome. The latter, however, became public property in Rome about 401, and was represented by some as being a criticism of Jerome. When Augustine learnt this, he wrote a third (*Ep.* 102), about 402-403, in which he justified himself. As he suspected, Jerome had been misled by the rumours that came to his ears. In his first letters to Augustine he refrained from answering the questions that had been put to him although the letter is perfectly polite in appearance, the rumblings of Jerome's anger may be clearly perceived. On receiving Jerome's first letter (*Ep.* 102, dating from 402-403), Augustine hastened (*Ep.* 101) to mollify the irascible solitary, who finally (404) replied to the question that had been put to him (*Ep.* 102); he maintained his interpretation of the Apostles' difference at Antioch and showed that a translation of the Bible was necessary; further, he again asked Augustine, in this and in another letter (*Ep.* 105), to avoid ticklish questions in the future. In his next letter (*Ep.* 116)² of 404 or 405, Augustine again made his excuses, he still maintained his opinion regarding Saints Peter and Paul, but gave way to Saint Jerome as regards the translation of the Bible. He brought his letter to an end by an appeal for a frank and open friendship leaving room for a free exchange of opinion. This ended the first correspondence (405)³. It was re-opened ten years later.

The new exchange of letters was occasioned by the Pelagian controversy. The tone was friendly on both sides and it was again Saint Augustine who took the initiative. In 415 he despatched Paulus Orosius to Palestine with two letters to Jerome (*Ep.* 131, 132, dealing with special questions; the origin of the soul, the exegesis of *Jac.*, II, 10). Orosius⁴ was especially charged with gleaning information regarding the deeds and writings of Pelagius. Jerome also took special interest in this latter question, since Pelagius had borrowed his teaching from the Syrian priest, Rufinus, whom Jerome himself had sent from Bethlehem to the West in 399 to keep a watch on Rufinus of Aquileia. Already in 414 Jerome

¹ According to Saint Jerome, the difference between Saint Peter and Saint Paul was only apparent, having been concerted beforehand as an innocent inculcating of winning over the Judaizers. Augustine feared that falsehood was thus introduced into an inspired book and never admitted this interpretation of the Scriptures.

² This letter, 116, completed Augustine's letter, 105, and served as the final answer to Jerome's letters, 105, 112, 115.

³ Although this correspondence did not result in any collaboration, it at least led to a friendship based on mutual esteem. But even to achieve that result Augustine's consideration, condescension and humility had to be thrown into the breach, as well as the repute of his great talents. Nothing less than this would have sufficed to preserve the long friendship which had bound together Jerome and Augustine. — ⁴ See F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, II, p. 96-97.

had taken up a stand against Pelagianism in an important letter (Æl. 133 to Ctesiphon), in which he controverted the Pelagian teaching of *impeccability* and *apathy*. Not content with this, he again treated the same subject in 415 in a long treatise in three books, in dialogue form (*Dialogues Against the Pelagians*)¹. Especially noteworthy in this work is the demonstration of Catholic doctrine by means of the Scriptures. Towards the end, the author apologises for having approached this subject after it had already been dealt with by Saint Augustine; he feared that his work might be thought superfluous: *Ne dicatur mihi illud Horatii: In Sylvain ne ligna*. Paulus Orosius returned to Africa in 416 bringing with him a letter from Jerome to Augustine which counselled a united stand against heresy (134)⁸. The Oriental Pelagians revenged themselves on Jerome by pillaging his monasteries at Bethlehem. He had at least the consolation of seeing this new heresy condemned in 418, before dying in his beloved solitude at Bethlehem on the 30th September, 419³.

C). Saint Jerome's character. Saint Jerome was before all a writer, and it is from this standpoint that he must first be judged. He stands out from the other Fathers of this great century "by the art of his style, the wealth of his language, the personal character of his compositions, and his versatility. He was more susceptible than any other to praise of a well turned phrase, or to adverse criticism of a badly chosen word, a faulty idiom or a poor expression. The most divergent quotations from classical authors flowed spontaneously from his pen and were mingled smoothly with the fruit of his own invention. He was acquainted with every device of the rhetor, every resource of the professional writer"⁴. Hence a certain tendency to exaggerate, a taste for satire, and lastly a degree of "touchiness" which justifies Lilemont's severe judgment: "Whosoever had him as an adversary was always the vilest of men"⁵.

¹ *Ibid.*, I, p. 324-327.

Jerome sent two other letters to Augustine, in 418, in the heat of the Pelagian controversy (Æl. 141, 142), and another (143) in 419 shortly before he died. Augustine's answer is not extant.

This date is disputed. Saint Jerome's death is usually placed 111420. We refer 419 with Cavaliere: *op. cit.*, II, 56-63.

³ * 1st. Ca VALLERA, *Op. cit.*, I, p. 11-12.

⁴ LileMONT, *Mimoires*, xit, 2. See Cavaliere, *ibid.*, p. 12.

The *weaker side* of Saint Jerome's character is well known : his somewhat proud aloofness and his irascibility, a certain tendency to think himself surrounded by enemies and intrigue. But these only too evident defects should not be allowed to obscure his eminent virtues; his honesty and sincerity, his faithfulness and devotion to his friends, his austerity and the renunciation which led him to embrace a very real poverty, his love for the Scriptures and his eagerness to know them, the rectitude of his Catholicity and the vigour of his faith, which plunged him into so many conflicts with the enemies of orthodoxy; his passion for asceticism, which he imparted to other great souls, and his tender love for Mary, whose perpetual virginity he so brilliantly upheld; and last of all, his ardent pursuit of intellectual labours, by which he has become not only the model of all Christian scholars, but which also acquired for him that thorough learning which is seen in all his works, and which constitutes their real worth.

II. WORKS OF SAINT JEROME.

A). Works on the text of the Scriptures.

i. Saint Jerome made revisions and translations of the text of the Scriptures.

At first he was content to revise an early Latin version, the *Peint Itala*. The text of the New Testament which he thus determined at Rome in 384 is that of the present Vulgate. The *Psalter*, which was revised at the same time, is now used only at Saint Peter's, Rome (*Psalterium Romanum*). In Palestine, he first continued his work of revision and made use of Origen's Hexapla; he recast the *Psalter* (*Psalterium Gallicanum*)* which now constitutes the text of the Vulgate and then revised nearly all the books of the Old Testament, but this latter text is lost, except for the *Book of Job*. Then about 390 he undertook the task of rendering, as he put it, the whole of the Old Testament according to the truth of the Hebrew, or at least all the books which were extant in Hebrew or Aramaean. *Tobias* and *Judith* were translated from the Aramaean, and the deuterocanonical parts of *Ibim* and *Esther* from the Greek (*Baruch*, *Machabees* I and II, *Ecclesiastical* and the *Book of Wisdom* were omitted, since Jerome suspected their canonicity). This new version, finished about 405, gradually spread, in spite of opposition, and by the end of the sixth century had been adopted in practice throughout almost the whole of the West. It was given till

1 At least that of the four Gospels; it is not certain that Saint Jerome revised the rest of the N. T. See F. Cavallera, in *Bull. lit., eccl.*, 1920, p. 269.

* Distinct from the text translated from the Hebrew : *Psalterium Ibraicum*

name of *Vulgate* in the thirteenth century. Titus the present Vulgate embraces four kinds of text: the New Testament (or at least the Gospels), the first of Jerome's revisions; the Old Testament, translated by him, except the Psalter, which is his second revision, and four deuterocanonical books of which the text is that of the early Latin version.

2. Saint Jerome's Scriptural translations are of the greatest value, and may be considered as the best part of his work. They have, however, their *defects*: some, written too hastily (*Tobias* in a day, *Esther* in a night) are poor, whilst others, although rapidly executed, are extremely good, (the three books of Solomon, written in three days, *tridui opus*): there is not one book which does not contain some inexactitude or minor error, but the work as a whole is a very faithful rendering of the original. The translation of the historical proto-canonical books is especially outstanding. Saint Jerome had not only to render the sense of the Hebrew, but also to take into account expressions which had become traditional in the East, and observe the limits of good taste. It was necessary for him, moreover, to add to his knowledge of the original tongue an acquaintance with Jewish history and customs, in order to appreciate the real meaning of the texts and avoid a meaningless literal translation. It may truly be said with Bardenhewer that Saint Jerome was, for his time, a *translator of genius*, destined by Providence to give to the Latin Church a Bible identical in substance with the inspired original.

B). Scriptural Studies.

Saint Jerome's *commentaries* constitute the best part of his exegetical work. Others, however, are extant and must be mentioned.

1) Intimate *homilies (tractatus)* preached to the monks in the Church at Bethlehem. These are chiefly notable for simplicity of development and the practical character of the moral and ascetic teaching.

b) Treatises on Hebrew philology: 1. The *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Henesim*, a complete work, forming a real commentary on the first book of the Bible, and a series of notes on early Jewish exegesis, are rendered especially valuable by the author's critical and philological remarks, in spite of a certain number of questionable etymologies; 2. The *Liber il, nominibus Hebraicis*, which may properly be termed "Etymological

¹ At least 73 are extant, on the Gospels, the Psalms, etc., edited by It. Morin, *op. cit.* The same author treats of these "monuments of Saint Jimmie's preaching" in *Etudes, 'textes et Découvertes*, t. 1913, p. 220-293.

² *J. L.*, 23, 935-1010. — 3 *P. L.*, 23, 771-858.

Lexicon", is entirely devoted to elucidating the origin of proper names in the Bible. It must be avowed that in this work the author was guided chiefly by his imagination'.

f) A treatise on Biblical Geography, *Liber de situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum**, a veritable "Geographical Lexicon" consisting of a good translation of Eusebius' *Onomasticon*, with supplements on 90 names, which, however, are of little worth³.

Saint Jerome's commentaries may be classed under two heads: the *detached* commentaries, and the *great series* of prophetic commentaries. Neither the little commentaries (*commentarioli*) on the Psalms, which come under the head of the above mentioned homilies⁴, nor the great *Tractatus in Psalmos*, which are no longer extant, will be treated here⁵.

I. Several of Saint Jerome's detached commentaries are extant.

a) The Commentary on Ecclesiastes⁶ (386-387?) appears to be his earliest thorough exegetical work⁷;

b) The Commentaries on the four Epistles of Saint Paul (Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, Philemon)⁸. Although they were hastily dictated about the same period (387-389), reveal that the exegete had already a real understanding of his subject. In his explanation of the Epistle to the Galatians he puts forward the theory that the disagreement between Saint Peter and Saint Paul at Antioch was a simulation, agreed on by the two Apostles, the better to instruct the faithful; Saint Augustine, as has been said, would not admit this explanation⁹.

c) The Commentary on Saint Matthew (398): although this work was composed in great haste in a fortnight to oblige his friend, Eusebius of Cremona, who was about to go on a journey, it has always been widely consulted and still has its uses. Saint Jerome gives only those indications necessary to the understanding of the actual text of the Gospel; he intended to complete the work by the addition of moral and spiritual applications at a later date, but this supplement was never written.

* The work is an adapted re-edition of early *Onomastica*, attributed in the fourth century to Philo, for the Old Testament, and to Origen for the New Testament. Modern editions, J. Martianay (1699), P. de Lagarde (1870). See WoTZ, in *Text. u. (Inters., t. xtr., 1914.*

= *P. L.*, 23, 859-928.

³ See above, p. 324.

⁴ These are drawn from an apocryphal compilation, edited among the works of Saint Jerome, *Breviarium in Psalmos*; *P. L.*, 26, 821-1270.

⁵ These were scholarly commentaries on Ps. 10-16, modelled on Origen's *Homilies*. Only one of these has come to light (probably), the commentary on Ps. 15, found by D. Morin, *op. cit.*, 1903.

⁶ *P. L.*, 23, 1009-1116.

⁷ According to Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 135-137.

⁸ *P. L.*, 26, 307-438 (Gal., 3 books); 439-554 (Eph., 3 bks.); 555-600 (Titus) 599-618 (Phil.).

⁹ See above, p. 578.

¹⁰ *P. L.*, 26, 15-218.

z7) The Commentary on the Apocalypse ^{*}(date unknown): this is no more than an adaptation of Victorinus of Pettau's work, aided by references to the work of the Donatist, Tychonius

2. The *great series* of commentaries to which Jerome gave especial care is devoted to the Prophets. They were begun at the same time as he undertook his translation of the Bible from the Hebrew, and were carried on with untiring perseverance until the end of his life.

The Commentaries on the Minor Prophets, begun about 392, progressed but slowly. At the beginning (392), Jerome composed five: on Nahum, Micheas, Sophonias, Aggeus and Habacuc³, in that order, Ionas and Abekas⁴ were treated in 396; and it was not until 406 or 407 that the series came to an end with Zacharias, Malachias, Osee, Joel, and Amos⁵, all composed about the same period. The exegete's *method* is very apparent. He begins by determining the literal sense by comparing his translation from the Hebrew and the other Greek versions with the early version⁶. But as Cavallera remarks, the literal sense, or the *history*, as he terms it, had but little charm for Jerome, he endeavoured before all to find the *typical sense*, by applying "to Jesus Christ, to the Church and to the faithful, on the one hand, and to heretics, the devil and sinners on the other, the text of the prophet and the events he has just mentioned"⁷. Like Origen he often misused allegorical exegesis. "It should not be forgotten, however, that such as it was, it provided rich matter for meditation to those for whom it was written"⁸.

The Commentaries on the Major Prophets quickly followed. In 407 Jerome began to comment *Daniel*⁹, using a slightly different method: he explained only the more difficult passages and passed rapidly over the others, without, however, discarding the general procedure of commentaries. This new style of commentary was not appreciated by most of his readers and the exegete was constrained to return to his ordinary method of literal explanation followed by figurative and mystical applications¹⁰. The latter is again found in the *Commentary on Isaías*¹¹ (408-410), which is probably the greatest of Jerome's exegetical works, not only

¹ *Corpus* of Vienna, 1916 (t. XLIX). Text discovered in 1895 by Haussleiter, iv editor. Dom Morin, in *Revue bibl.*, 1903, p. 225-236.

See above, p. 274.

² *P. L.*, 25, 1231-1271 (Nahum), 1151-1230 (Micheas), 1337-1388 (Sophonias), 1387-1416 (Aggeus), 1273-1338 (Habacuc).

³ *A. Z.*, 25, 1117-1152 (Jonas). 1097-1118 (Abdias).

⁴ *P. I.*, 25, 1415-1542 (Zacharias), 1541-1578 (Malachias), 815-946 (Osee), <117-988 (Joel), 989-1096 (Amos).

This provided Jerome with an occasion for a lively criticism of the Septuagint.

F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 148. — ⁸ *Ibid.* — ⁵ *P.*, 25, 491-584.

F. Cavallera, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 312. — ⁶ *P.*, 24, 17-678.

on account of its extent (18 books), but also on account, of its excellence. "As a rule, the literal sense is really consistent and clearly rendered, and the exceptional beauty of the text and the forceful solemnity of the prophetic oracles are often finely brought out with rare expressiveness"¹. Moreover, applications were not hard to find in a work whose author was at the same time a prophet, an evangelist and an apostle. The same method is again found with the same perfection in the *Commentary on Ezechiel* (410-414)²* but it was occasionally marred by excessive allegorism. More sober in this respect was the *Commentary on Jeremías* (414-416, unfinished)³, which equals the two foregoing commentaries "for soundness of doctrine and wealth of original views", but which "surpasses them by a more constant endeavour to keep to the historical sense and to avoid the obscurities and pitfalls inseparable from allegorical interpretation"⁴. Interesting allusions to the Pelagian controversy are also to be found in this works.

As an exegete, says Forget⁶, Saint Jerome belongs to the School of Alexandria. This is revealed by the manner in which he envisages the content of the Scriptures. It "is to his mind a sea too deep, too full of mysterious abysses, even in the least difficult passages, to allow its hidden treasures to be revealed by a single and superficial interpretation... Parallel with, and above the idea of the speculative and practical, historical and moral truth, directly expressed by the letter, there exists a world of higher truths which demands a far more attentive study and which we must endeavour to reach". He spent his whole life in this search for the *spiritual sense*, after the method of Origen. After the Origenist controversy, however, he was careful not to fall into the master's errors. He took great pains to base his mystical sense on a scientifically determined *literal sense*, and from this point of view a real advance may be remarked in his work, which must be attributed either to a growing facility in the interpretation of the text or the need of sedulously avoiding purely fanciful renderings, or even to his

■J. Fqrgbt, *o/*, «7., col. 911. —»7> 25. 15-490.

s P. L., 24, 679-900. — * J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 912.

s.Saint Jerome made a somewhat factitious connection between Pélagianóin and Origenism; hence his strictures of Origen, to be found particularly in tin* commentary'. See F. Cavaillera, *op. cit.*, ir, p. 125.

6 In *Diet, thiol.*, art. quoted, col. 958.

relations with the Jewish doctors¹. These commentaries on the Major Prophets reveal to us in varying degrees the exegete at his best.

C) Various other Works.

1. Translations. Saint Jerome translated many Greek works. The following is a list of these works :

a) 78 of *Origen's homilies*²: 14 on Jeremías, 14 on Ezechiel and 9 on Isaias (all in 380-381), 2 on the Canticle of Canticles (383-384), and, lastly, 39 on Saint Luke (about 389-392).

¿) The *De Principiis*³ (399).

c) Paschal letters of *Theophilus* of Alexandria, and one of Saint Epiphanius⁴

¿Z) The *Rule of Saint Pachomius* and divers letters s.

r) Eusebius of Caesarea's *Onomasticon* (mentioned above) and the same author's *Chronicle*, which is dealt with below.

/) Didymus' treatise *De Spiritu Sancto* (384-386 circa)⁶⁷

2. Controversial Works. All these have already been mentioned in the paragraph on his life.

a) *Against John of Jerusalem* (396)'.
b) *Apology against Rufinus*⁸ (401, books I and II; 402, book III).

c) *Altercatio luciferiani et orthodoxi*² (378?)
rf) *Adversus Helvidium*² (383).

e) *Contra Jovinianum* " (393).

/) *Contra Vigilantium* " (406).

g) *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*² (415).

3. Historical Works. rz) To the translation (380) of the Synchronistic Tables or Chronological Canons, the IInd part of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, Saint Jerome added a Hird part⁴ or *continuation*, which consists of a general history from 325 to 378; this work does not lack merit and has been found of great use⁵.

* J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 962.

P. L., 23, 1117-1144 (Cant.); 24, 901-936 (Is.); 25, 585-786 (Jer. Ezech.); 26, 219-306 (Luke).

¹ See above, p. 198-199. — 4 See above, p. 496.

5 P. L., 23, 65-100. See above, p. 504.

6 P. L., 23, 101-154. Saint Jerome undertook this work on account of the Ist impression he got from Saint Ambrose's treatise on the Holy Ghost, in which the Greek original is freely used. This work was written under the patronage of Saint Damasus.

7 P. L., 23, 355-396. — 8 P. L., 23, 397-492. — See above, p. 575.

P. L., 23, 155-182. — 10 P. L., 23, 183-206.

" P. L., 23, 211-338. — » P. L., 23, 339-352.

" P. L., 23, 495-590-

14 P. L., 33-702. Recent edit, in *Corpus of Vienna*, 1913 (t. VII, Works of Eusebius).

15 The only flaw in this work is a number of somewhat severe, summary and trenchant judgments, which, however, were not always undeserved.

i) The *De Viris Illustribus*' (392) was perhaps given too much praise in early times, but on the other hand it comes in for more than its fair share of criticism nowadays. To it is due the credit of having founded the History of Christian Literature. In spite of its defects (omissions, disorder, inexactitudes, partiality), the work is still of great use for the information it gives concerning 135 writers, from Saint Peter until the author himself, who, together with a list of his writings until 392, occupies the last chapter. Although Saint Jerome had originally intended to speak only of those writers who had published outstanding works on the Scriptures, he also cites heretics, Jews, and even Pagans, Tatianus, Philo, Seneca, etc. To our eyes the part dealing with the fourth century is the most useful, since it consists of really first-hand information. Elsewhere Jerome copies Eusebius.]

c) Three biographies of solitaries* are still extant: *Saint PatM* hermit (about 376), the monk *Malchus* (about 386-387), and *Saint Hilarión*, founder of Palestinian monachism (about 391). Letters, 60, 108, 127 alc. contain the lives of Nepotianus, Paula and Marcella.

The Hieronymian Martyrology is not due to Saint Jerome, but is a compilation which has been attributed to him without serious reasons.

4. Saint Jerome's correspondence is perhaps the most perfect part of his work from a literary point of view. It is composed of some 125 letters which deal with the most varied matters. Among the *ascetic letters*, which are the most celebrated and which treat of the religious life and right living, the following should be noted: letters 14 to *Heliódorus*, whom the author begs to come to Chalcis; 22, to *Eustochiumi*, whom Jerome exhorts to perfection; 52, to *Nepotianus* for whom he outlines a plan of the priestly life. Under this head may also be classed the *necrological letters* mentioned above, together with the Rule of Saint Pachomius, translated for Eustochium about 404 after the death of Paula. His correspondence with *Saint Augustine*,

* P. L., 23- 601-720. There are various recent editions.

3 P. L., 23, 17-28 (Paul), 29-52 (Hil.), 53-60 (Male.). French trans., of the first two by F. de Labriolle, in *Coll. Sc. et Rd.*, n. 436, Paris.

3 See above, p. 568-569.

4 P. L., 22, 3251224 (150 letters, to which must be added the four edited by Dom de Bruyne, *Rev. hénéd.*, 1910, t. xxvii, p. i-ii). All these, 1-154, are in the *Corpus* of Vienna, I. 54-55. See F. Cavallera on the last letters, *op. cit.*, II, p. 56-63. Of these letters about 30 are letters received by Jerome; more than fifty are short notes, but more than seventy are true letters or Epistles.

3 Extracts in *Lettres choisies de S. Jérôme*, by Mgr Lagrange, Paris, 1875. (The letters are numbered differently from those in the recent editions).

6 P. L., 22, 347-355. — 7 *9 -6., 22, 394-425. — 3 P. A., 22, 527-540.

9 See also letters 54, to Furia; 79, to Salvina; 107, to Laeta; 125, to Rusticu! 127, to Principia.

10 Ep. 60, 108, 127. See above.

See above, p. 577-578.

so important from a doctrinal point of view, should also be mentioned. Other letters, some of which form veritable treatises, deal with *theology* and *exegesis*. All these letters, even the simplest, are a splendid indication of the saint's spirituality and give a clear picture of the Church in his time. Saint Jerome himself made several collections of his letters. When writing them he usually thought of his public; hence the exaggerated care he sometimes took with his style.

III. THE DOCTRINE OF SAINT JEROME.

A). The Doctor. His Authority.

In spite of his admirable qualities as a writer and the virility of his character, Jerome *was not an original thinker*. He never abandoned himself to personal meditation of dogma as did Augustine, Anselm or Thomas Aquinas. Even on those points which he was forced to study with greater thoroughness in order to defend orthodoxy, he kept strictly to what he found in tradition, without in any way inspiring it with his own personality. He was not therefore, in the proper sense of the word, a *theologian*, nor was he an orator and pastor of souls as was the greater number of the *Doctors* of this period. Nevertheless his doctrinal authority is not thereby lessened.

I. This authority is drawn from three chief sources.

The extent and soundness of his learning. Chosen by Divine Providence to give to the Latin Church a Scriptural text identical in substance with the inspired original, he possessed all the qualities needful for the accomplishment of such a task. He was before all a *scholar*. He was incontestably more erudite than any other of the Latin Fathers. He had studied with great care even profane literature and was acquainted with at least all the Latin works. But what is more important, as Saint Augustine¹ tells us, he had read every Christian work, and the fruit of this reading enriched his own commentaries. He had a thorough knowledge of Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew, in spite of the carping criticisms to which he has been subjected as regards the latter²;

¹ *Coni. Jul.*, i, 34.

² "The exaggerated importance he attributed to the Jewish tradition of the time provided the occasion for criticism; but in the appreciation of his learning it would be unfair not to take into account the circumstances of the age and thus to judge him by modern standards". O. Bardenhever, *Patr.*, II, p. 387.

he also knew Aramaean sufficiently well. Lastly, his general education as a translator and exegete was completed by his acquaintance with the connected subjects, sacred and profane History and Geography. It can only be regretted that in the field of Biblical learning, in which he stands unchallenged, he did not formulate, as other Doctors did in their proper sphere, a statement of principle, and elaborate, in particular, a complete *theory of inspiration*. Only scattered elements of the latter are to be found in his work 2.

b) His unshakable devotion to tradition. In this he found his strength tyhen attacking heresy. As Father Largent says, "he was well acquainted with traditional teaching; and like Bossuet at a later time, was at his best in this domain" 3; to the denials of the innovators he sometimes objected positive texts of the early writers, sometimes the age-long uses of the Church. He sought even the sense of the Scriptures in the traditional teaching of the Church; the sense taught by the Church 4 is the very sense intended by the Holy Ghost, Who is the author of the Scriptures. And this leads us to speak of the third mark of Saint Jerome's doctrinal authority.

c) The clarity of his teaching on the Catholic rule of faith. The Church gives the true sense of the Scriptures and is thç representative of tradition. Those who will not listen to the Church are heretics, and therefore enemies to Jerome. Shortly before his death he made this testimony: "As for the heretics, I have never spared them; on the contrary I have seen to it in every possible way that the Church's enemies were also my enemies". This may easily be believed. The doctrinal authority of the Church in general he attributes to the *Roman Church* 5 in particular, with an insistence which has rarely been surpassed. In his appeal to Damasus, in the celebrated letter, 15, written from Syria in 376, he enumerates all the titles of Rome: "Ego nullum primum nisi Christum sequetis, *beatitudini tuæ*, id est, *cathedra Petri*, *communione consocior*: super illam petram ædificatam ♦ *ecclesiam scio...*" and he adds that whoever "is not within

¹ Dom L. Sanders studies his teaching on this point, *op. cit.*

² See J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 927-957, who gives a summary of the studies published on this subject; that of Dom Sanders and of others who hold a contrary opinion.

» Largent, *op. cit.*, p. 152. — « See J. Forget, *op. cit.*, 976-078
s *Ibid.*; 978-980.

the ark of Noe will perish in the flood", In other letters he often stresses this principle; that the Roman Church, whose faith was praised by the Apostle Paul, was instituted as the supreme rule and definite norm of revealed truth '.

2. It has been affirmed that, although Saint Jerome's doctrinal authority is sound enough as regards the principles on which it reposes, it is lessened by a certain amount of erroneous teaching in particular instances, which may be considered as a serious defect. The following are the difficulties which have been raised in this respect :

«) The chief of these difficulties regards the ecclesiastical hierarchy². Saint Jerome seems to declare that the episcopate is not superior to the order of priesthood and is of purely ecclesiastical origin. There is no doubt that the texts brought forward³ exalt the priesthood, but although this intention is clear the implications of the texts are far from being evident : in any case the presbyterian theory cannot be safely based on these documents. In any interpretation of them we must take into account Jerome's usual exaggeration when defending a cause he holds dear.

The following are the points which seem to stand out in the texts brought forward :

1. The primitive communities were subjected to a *college of priests* (There were also churches, known to Saint Jerome, directed by only one religious superior).

2. The members of this college were called *ἐπίσκοποι* or *πρεσβύτεροι*, expressions which were originally almost synonymous.

3. It may be asked whether these chiefs of the community were all bishops or all priests. It does not seem that Saint Jerome put the question to himself in that form, but he tended to consider them as having simply the dignity of the priesthood, since to his mind the consequent development consisted less in a diminution of the college of priests than in the elevation of a single superior placed above the others, who performed the ordinations and governed the community⁴.

¹ *Ep.* 46, ii ; 63, 2; 130, 16. See O. Bardenhewer, *ibid.*, p. 390.

- See J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 965-976.

³ *Connu*, on the *Ep. to Titus*, 1, 5; *P. L.*, 26, 596; *Ep.* 69, to Oceanus, 3; mid chiefly *Ep.* 146 to Eyangelus; *P. L.*, 22, 656 and 11921195. He declares, in the first : *Ita episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine quam dispositionis dominicæ veritate presbyteris esse majores.*

⁴ The case of the *Bishop of Alexandria*, who, until the time of Saint Dionysius, was one of the members of the priestly college, chosen by his colleagues, is mentioned by Saint Jerome (*Ep.* 146) as an exception. Moreover, he does not say that the elected member received no ordination. J. Forget, *op. cit.*, 11-973'976. The contrary opinion, however, is defended by sound authors, together with Mgr Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de thiol. positive*, 6th ed., p. 271.

4. The purpose of this very real superior authority of the chiefs or bishops was to prevent dissension in the Church, and it is perhaps for fear of schism that a discipline was developed tending to establish everywhere a monarchic episcopate by subjecting all the colleges of priests to a bishop actually present

Thus the episcopate, fundamentally of divine origin, is partly and from a secondary point of view of ecclesiastical origin. Saint Jerome stressed this latter aspect the better to show the dignity of the order of priests; in his usual downright way he declares that the episcopate is "more ecclesiastical than divine", but it does not follow that it is "purely ecclesiastical".

à) But although it may be that Saint Jerome has erred on this particular point, his general authority as a Doctor remains unquestioned. It cannot be compromised by a partial errors. Nor is it weakened by still another error, this time indisputable, which bears on the very subject in which he specialised: the negation of the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament⁴. He was influenced in this conclusion by the Jewish atmosphere in which he had moved since he began to live in Palestine⁵. Similarly, he gradually began to reject the Septuagint, not only by ceasing to regard it as an inspired book, as he and many of his contemporaries had first thought it, but also by pointing out the many minor errors it contained⁶. His rejection of the inspiration of the Septuagint, of course, redounds to his credit.

c) His eschatological teaching also marked a definite advance, although he never succeeded entirely in purging it from all the imperfections left by Origenism. Prior to the controversy, he had admitted several of Origen's most risky opinions, such as the final salvation of *all men*, and even perhaps of the devils, and even perhaps the spiritual nature of risen bodies. After 394, Saint Jerome rejected and controverted these opinions, but continued "to think that

¹ See what was said on this subject, p. 58. Jerome does not say that this episcopate came into being under the pressure of a number of ambitious men, but that the *circumstance* which gave rise to this disciplinary progress was abuses of this nature.

² J. Forget, *op. cit.* Moreover, even with this reservation, the expression supposes too much.

³ There are sound authors who think that he really admitted the purely ecclesiastical origin of the episcopate, and that in this case he erred by cutting himself off from tradition. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, II, p. 328.

⁴ Frol, *galeatus*, and other divers prefaces.

⁵ L. Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 196-247. E. MANGENOT, *Canon des Livres Saints*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 1577-1578. — ⁶ J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 939-943.

i certain mitigation of the pains of the devils was possible, and never ceased to hold that *all Christians* would finally be saved, and that the torment of sinners would not be eternal”^{*} provided they had never been apostate. These opinions were shared by other Doctors, and notably by Saint Ambrose. As the magisterium of the Church had not as yet made any definite pronouncement on these questions there was some uncertainty in men's minds. It was left to Saint Augustine to decide on the essential points of this teaching. But like Saint Augustine, and before him, Jerome combated millenarianism² as Origen had done.

B). Special features of Saint Jerome's teaching.

It will suffice here to mention only his teaching on *grace*, his *moral and ascetic* doctrine and his ideas on *Our Lady* and *the Saints*, since these are points he developed expressly in special treatises.

I. Grace. Saint Jerome spared no pains in attacking Pelagianism, which he regarded as a survival of Paganism, as may be seen more especially in letter 1333. He also refuted the theory of the total absence of the passions (*ἀπάθεια*) and the consequent possibility of man remaining sinless by means of his own efforts (*ἀναμαρτησία*, impeccability). In the “Dialogue” he established the *necessity of grace*, chiefly by reference to the Scriptures. Jerome did not deny a *true personal will* to man, but he made it depend on divine assistance: “*Velie et nolle nostrum est: ipsumque quod nostrum est, sine Dei miseratione nostrum non est*”⁴. In the Commentary on Jeremías, he declares “*quod non solum opera, sed et voluntas nostra Dei nitatur auxilio*”⁵. Further on he affirms that we cannot even repent without supernatural aid and concludes⁶ *Vide quantum sit auxilium Dei et quam fragilis humana conditio, ut hoc ipsum quod agimus poenitentiam, nisi nos Dominus ante converterit!, nequaquam implere valeamus*”. It is true that elsewhere Saint Jerome says that God in His mercy looks to us to do

¹ *Adv. Pelag.*, I, 28. *In Isaiam*, t.xvt, 24. *Ep.* 119, n. 7. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, It, p. 341-342. J. Forget, *op. cit.*, col. 980-982.

In Isaiam, I, c. 1; *P. L.*, 24, 23, etc.

² Letter to Ctesiphon. See above, p. 579. — ^{*} *Ep.* 130, to Deinctriades, n. 12. *In Jerem.*, in c. xxiv, end. — 6 *Ibid.*, in c. xxxi, 18-19.

He had just written: “*Postquam enim converteris me, et ad te conversus fib ro, tum cognoscam*”. *Ibid.*

penance and to be converted !: but these assertions, made before the Pelagian controversy, are not contrary to the foregoing, which render the sense more precise.

Other propositions which seem to savour of Semi-Pelagianism have been pointed out in Saint Jerome's writings and even in the *Dialogue* where he declares that, although God consummates the good which is in us, it depends on us to begin it: "Ut nostrum sit rogare, illius tribuere quod rogatur; *nostrum incipere, illius perficere*; nostrum offerri: quod possumus, illius implere quod non possumus"'. But this text must not be taken apart from the above mentioned letter to Demetriades (130). Moreover, even before the Pelagian controversy Saint Jerome wrote: "Dei enim *vocare* est et nostrum credere; nec statini si nos non credimus, impossibilis (i. e. *impotens*') Deus est; sed potentiam suam nostro arbitrio derelinquit ut justī voluntas praeium consequatur"‡. Here the author leaves rather to God the inception of the work of salvation and its consummation to man. He stresses first one point of view and then the other, but they do not exclude each other. He cannot be reproached with being incoherent; at the most, one can wish that he had outlined a wider synthesis of the theology of grace. Such will be found in Saint Augustine. It must be remembered that Saint Jerome was more concerned with defending the rights of Christian morality and asceticism.

2. Moral and ascetic teaching. All Christian *morality* had been questioned by the theories of *Jovinianus*, who affirmed that: *a*) those who receive baptism with abundant faith cannot sin; *b*) that those who by faith preserve the grace of baptism will have the same reward in heaven whatever their works; *c*) that, moreover, all sins are equal in gravity, just as all good works are equal in merit! This in fact was no more than the Protestant teaching of *salvation by faith without works*. At the period in question it was especially calculated to undermine the teaching of asceticism, and virginity in particular, which latter it supposed was equalled by the married state which entailed much less renunciation. The serious consequences of this system were stressed in Saint Jerome's vigorous and mordant refutation, inspired in many places by Tertullian. Here, as elsewhere, he has been reproached with having used exaggerated expressions, condemning not only "insatiable and tenacious marriage-mongers" but also marriage itself⁵. But the ambiguity lies in the author's mode of expression rather than in his ideas; they nevertheless caused a deal of uneasiness

¹ In *Psaia*m, xxx, 18. — 3 *Dial.*, m, I. Cf. *ibid.*, 1, 5.

³ In *Isaiani*, XLIX, 4. — 4 J. TIXERONT, *Hist. Dog.*, II, p. 245-247.

⁵ F. Cavaliera, *op. cit.*, I, p. 159-161.

in certain minds, and it was to dissipate this that Saint Augustine later wrote (about 401) his *De bono conjugali*.

The asceticism recommended by Saint Jerome was the religious life of which he was always an ardent defender and apologist, all the more eloquent in that he was the first to practise what he preached. He desired the chosen of God to be ready to sacrifice what they held most dear'. He counselled young ascetics : *a*) the love of *solitude* as opposed to the stifling atmosphere of the world³; *b*) *life in community* under the authority of a superior; *f*) *austerity* in dress and nourishment; *h*) continual prayer, inspired especially by the Psalms; *e*) the *study of the Scriptures* even in the original tongue. As is well known, he even persuaded young maidens and white-haired matrons to this mode of life. Generally speaking, it may be said that his preferences went to the austere conception of the religious life. His great soul was attracted by *great virtues*, for he detested mediocrity, both in the moral and in the intellectual sphere. It is easy to understand that such dispositions led him into occasional excesses both in preaching and writing. But whatever may have been his ruggedness, he was nevertheless a true apostle of the perfect life⁴.

3. Mary and the Saints. Besides defending the religious life against its adversaries, Saint Jerome found time to champion other excellent causes : *a*) he vigorously maintained the traditional teaching on the perpetual virginity of Our Lady, and affirmed that not only was she a virgin *ante partum*, but also *post partum* (against Helvidius) and *in partu* (against Jovinianus) ⁵; *b*~) against Vigilantius he not only defended monachism but also the veneration of martyrs and relics : " Honoramus autem reliquias martyrum ut eum cujus sunt martyres adoremus. Honoramus servos, ut honor servorum redundet ad Dominum " ⁶. Here again it is evident how well Saint Jerome was guided by that sense of tradition which imbued all his doctrine.



¹ See the ascetic letters mentioned above. See P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne*, I, p. 222-229.

- Licet parvulus ex collo pendeat nepos, licet sparso crino et scissis vestibibus, ubera quibus te nutrierat, mater ostendat, licet in limine pater jaceat, *fer calcasim perge patrem*, siccis oculis ad vexillum crucis evola; solum *pietatis genus* est in hac re, *esse crudelem*. *Ep.* 14, to *Heliodorus*, 2.

² Mihi oppidum career et solitudo paradisi. *Ep.* 125, 8.

⁴ See F. Cavaillera, *S. Jérôme et la vie parfaite*, in *Rev. Asc. et Myst.*, 1921., p. 101-127.—⁵ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, p. 330.331,

⁶ *Ep.*, 109, t. See *ibid.*

CHAPTER XV.

Cassian.

Special Bibliography.

Editions: *P. L.*, 49-50. *Corpus* of Vienna, 1886-1888, t. $\chi\iota\pi$ - $\chi\nu\iota$ (Petschenig's edit.). Eng. trans. Gibson, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (Oxford and New York, 1894), XI; Fr. trans. Dom Pickery, *Conférences*, S. Maximin, 1921. Studies: J. Lombard, *Jean Cassie*, sa vie, ses écrits, sa doctrine, Strasbourg, 1863. J. Laugier, *Saint Jean Cassien et sa doctrine sur la grâce*, Lyon, 1908. A. HOCH, *Lehre des J. Cassianus*, Freiburg im B., 1895. O. ABEL, *Studien su d. g. P. J. Cassianus*, Munich, 1904. Wrzoi, *Die Psychologie de J. K.* in *Divus Thomas*, 1918-1922. L. Roure, *Une école de volonté au IV^e siècle*, in *Etudes*, 1916, t. 147 (2 art.). DOM E. PICHERY, *Les conférences de Cassien et la doctrine spirituelle des Pères du désert*, in *Vie Spirituelle* 1921, t. in and IV. Dom A. Ménager, *La patrie de Cassien*, in *Echos d'Orient*, 1920, p. 330-358; *La doctrine spirituelle de Cassien*, in *Vie Spirituelle*, 1923, t. VII, p. 183-212. P. Godet, *Cassien*, in *Diet. théol.*, I col. 1823-1829. F. Cabrol, *Cassien*, in *Diet. Arch.*, col. 2348-2357. See also J. Fixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, III, p. 276-282 (on grace). L. Valentin, 5. *Prosper* (PAq. Paris, 1900, p. 306-319, and 851-856 (on grace). A. Saudreau, *La vie d'union à Dieu...* Paris, 1921, p. 89-100 (on spiritual teaching).

I. LIFE AND WORKS OF CASSIAN.

A). Life.

Cassian (about 360 to 435) was probably a native of some undetermined Eastern country¹; there are historians, however, who say he was born in Provence. The very sound education provided him by his family was rounded off and completed in the religious life, into which he entered, together with his friend Germanus, about 382. Two or three years later, desirous of advancing in the way of perfection and virtue, he and his friend visited the Egyptian solitaries. He remained here for nearly ten years, eagerly questioning the most famous of the solitaries and carefully recording their

* 1 According to *Gennadius*: "Cassianus, natione Scythia" (*De Viris ill.*, 61; *P. L.*, 58, 1094). The critic, Hoch, considered this word *Scythia* inadmissible and changed it to *Syrus*. It were surer to maintain it, however, and to consider Cassian as really a native of some region of Scythia, or more particularly Dobruja (S. Merkle's opinion), or better still *Scythiopolis* in Palestine. For this latter opinion see the above mentioned study by Dom Ménager in *Echos d'Orient*.

answers. When he finally bade farewell to these masters of the spiritual life he took away with him their precious treasures of ascetic teaching. He was ordained deacon about 400 in Constantinople by Saint John Chrysostom, and in 405 journeyed to Rome, bearing to Saint Innocent I the appeal of the clergy of Constantinople in favour of their exiled bishop. In the next few years he may have returned to the East for a time, but nothing is known. About 410 he was at Marseilles where he spent the remaining years of his life in founding the famous *Abbey of St. Victor*. He also founded and directed a monastery for women in the same town. His personal influence, the rules he gave to his monks, and especially his works on monastic spirituality contributed greatly to the spread of Monachism in the West, although the religious life already existed. After his death he was honoured as a saint and his feast is still celebrated in Provence. The Semi-Pelagian error which crept into his works, at a time when the true teaching in these difficult questions was not yet defined, should not be allowed to obscure his very real merits, his deep piety and his firm opposition to the Pelagian and Nestorian heresies.

B). Works.

Cassian's chief works are ascetic treatises; the *Institutiones* and the *Conferences*. His refutation of Nestorius (*De Incarnatione Domini*) written before the Council of Ephesus, was not lacking in worth, but was thrown into the shade by Saint Cyril's writings on the same subject. This treatise will be dealt with later in connection with the controversies it concerns.

1. The Institutions* (*De institutis cœnobiorum et de octo principalem vitiorum remediis libri XII*), written between 419-426 at the request of Saint Castor, Bishop of Apt; treat first of the *renerai obligations* of the monastic life: a) the dress of the religious (bk. 1); /) the office of the day and night (bks. π and tn); c) the renunciation of the world (bk. IV). The rest deals with the monks' primary moral obligations consisting in the *combat with the eight capital vices* (sins), i. e., gluttony (bk. v); impurity (bk. vi); avarice (bk. vn); anger (bk. vili); dejection (bk. ix); lukewarmness in things spiritual, or *acedia* (bk. x); vainglory (bk. xi); and pride (bk. xii).

2. The Conferences⁶ (*Collationes Patrum*) contain an account of three conversations which Cassian had with the most famous solitaries. «) *Tatfirst series* is composed of *ten conversations* which Cassian had

* At Marseilles, the 2nd July, with octave.

3 P. L., 50, 9-272. Treatise in 7 books. — 3 P. L., 49, 53-476.

4 The introductory letter of S. Castor is probably apocryphal.

5 See above, p. 510. — 6 P. L., 49, 477-1328.

with the Fathers of the desert of *Scale'*, the last desert he visited. Abbot Moses talked to him of the religious life in general and of discretion (Conf. I-π); other monks instructed him in the means of obtaining perfection and the obstacles which stand in the way of it (renunciation, τη; concupiscence, IV; the eight capital sins, v; patience, vi; lack of concentration on spiritual matters, vn; devils, Vili); lastly, Abbot Isaac talked to him of prayer (Conf. tx-x).

4) The *second series* contains seven conversations with the monks of the *Thebaid'va* Upper Egypt; Abbot Cheremon talked with him of perfection (bk. Xi), chastity (xn) and divine assistance (XIII, this is the clearest explanation of Cassian's teaching on grace); Abbot Nestor conversed on spiritual knowledge (xtv) and the gift of miracles (xv), while friendship (xvi) and the faithful keeping of promises (xvtt) were dealt with by Abbot Joseph.

c) The *last series* gives an account of seven other conversations with the Fathers of Lower Egypt (*Dioicos* or Delta) on religious life in general (xvm-xix), penance (xx), fasting (xxi), involuntary impurities (xxn), the perfect good (xxin), mortification (xxiv). The *perfect good* of which the Abbot Theonas speaks in the last and most interesting of three conversations (xxt-xxm) consists in the joyful possession of God by contemplation in the next life, and even in the present one.

The first series of these Conferences was written between 420 and 426, the second in 426, the third between 426 and 428. They are *Cassian's best work*. They had no parallel in Antiquity, and consequently enjoyed an immense popularity. They were greatly appreciated in the monasteries of the fifth century, and even until the Middle Ages; it is well known that Saint Thomas found in them a relaxation from his studies.

II. SPIRITUAL DOCTRINE.

Cassian was the first author to compose a vast and orderly work on the ascetic and mystical teaching of the Egyptian monks. Previously, only collections of sayings (*Apophthegmata*) or pious anecdotes (*Lausiac History*) had

¹ See p. 502-503.

² In this Conference (see c. 12-25, chiefly c. 17) Cassian gives a theory on falsehood diametrically opposed to that of Saint Augustine and Saint Thomas. Like hellebore, he says, which may be used to good purpose in certain dangerous illnesses, a lie may be told in cases when telling the truth would have disastrous results: *quando igitur grave aliquod imminet de veritatis confessione discrimen, tunc mendaciorum sunt recipienda perfugia*. *Ibid.*, 17. Clement of Alexandrin, like Plato who admitted the necessity of lying in the case of the public good (*Dr Depub.*, nt, 3) had previously taught the same doctrine (*Strom.*, vn, c. 9. *P.* (!, ♦9, 476). Saint John Chrysostom also speaks of permissible falsehood in the treatise *On the Priesthood* (bk. I, 6-9), but he meant only a certain reservation, quite different from lying in the proper sense of the word. Origen takes the same view as Clement and Cassian (*Stromata*, vi, fragm.; *P. G.*, II, 102); also Saint Hilary (*In Psalm.* 14, n. 10; *P. L.*, 9, 305). Cassian's opinion on the lawfulness of certain remedial falsehoods (*mendacio pro medicamento*) was generally rejected, chiefly owing to Saint Augustine's influence. See p. 651-652.

been written. Although the Abbot of Saint Victor did not achieve an *organised body of doctrine*, his varied and abundant documentation provided the material. This may be seen by the consideration of : 1. his teaching on perfection in general; 2. his teaching on prayer in particular.

A). Teaching on Perfection in general.

1. The purpose of the religious life is interior or *spiritual* perfection. This is dealt with in the first conference of each series. Although the xviii conference divides the monks into different classes according to their *indegree of exterior life* (the coenobites who tend to perfection, the anchorites who practise it and the sarabaites who recede from it) ¹, it immediately adds that perfection is not necessarily to be found in the solitude of the cell, but in the virtues of the ascetic man. In the xliii conference this perfection is shown to be *perfect charity*, which makes us like to God, since it is also the essential virtue of God; the way to perfection is marked by the degrees of servile love and the love of hope. The *first Conference*, which is even more detailed, shows that the purpose of the religious life is to lead the soul by purity of heart and perfect charity to the practice of *contemplation*, the foretaste of blessedness, the Kingdom of God within us, of which Saint Paul speaks : “ non est enim regnum Dei esca et potus, sed iustitia, pax et gaudium in Spiritu Sancto ” (*Rom. XIV, 17*). This kingdom, which will have its full perfection in the next life, is already *possessed* in this life by the just, who, by contemplation, can enjoy it in the Holy Ghost.

2. According to Cassian the chief hindrances to contemplation are :

a) the lust of the flesh and of the mind (Conf, iv);

the *eight capital vices* (Conf, v, chiefly Instit. bk. v-x ii). In this list Cassian omits *envy*; it was added by Saint Gregory the Great. On the contrary, he distinguishes *dejection* from *slothfulness*, which Saint Gregory combined. He also makes *vainglory* distinct from *pride*; Saint Gregory did likewise and showed that pride was the source of the seven other sins; Saint Thomas amended both these enumerations by combining these two last vices and giving the list of the seven capital sins now accepted in the West.

c) various *temptations* (chiefly Conf, vi and vu);

rf) the *devil*, whose power, however, is limited (Conf. vut).

¹ Conf. XVIII, c. 4-7. In ch. 8 he adds another class of monks, inferior even to the sarabaites; those whom Saint Benedict termed *gyrovagi* (*Peg.*, c. 1).

■ Conf., IX, c. 13-15. See below, *Teaching on Prayer*.

3. The means *directly adapted to overcome these hindrances* are chiefly, together with prayer, which will be treated below although from a different aspect :

a) the *giving up* of the riches of this world, of one self and all material good (Conf. li) ;

;) *penance* (Conf, xx) which also constitutes an excellent satisfaction for sin ;

c) *fasting* (Conf, xxi) which is a means to acquire virtue and not an end in itself;

rf) *mortification* (Conf, xxiv) which should be interior, in order to lead the soul to God, on Whom alone the ascetic's heart and mind should be fixed.

The virtues, of course, are also a means of overcoming obstacles, but also by turning the soul to good they directly contribute to the realisation of perfection. The first moral virtues necessary to the monk, in addition to those which oppose a direct bulwark to the obstacles in the way of perfection, are those entailed by community life and which are especially needful to beginners (*humility, obedience, mildness, charity*, etc. ; see Conf, xix) ; then follow :

<) *discretion* (Conf, n) which preserves the balance between excessive fervour and the lack of it;

b) *patience* (Conf, vi) which teaches indifference both to adversity and prosperity ;

c) *true supernatural friendship*, which supposes that all are equally ardent in the pursuit of perfection;

<Z) *fidelity to promises* (Conf, xvn) ;

e) *purity of soul* which leads to the vision of God, and which comes from God alone (Conf, xxii and passim).

Peace, so highly esteemed by Cassian¹, is not so much a virtue as the consummation of all the virtues, or an effect of charity which is the most necessary and the greatest of all the virtues. This supernatural peace is a gift of God. It will be better understood when perfect prayer, which is one of the conditions of peace, has been dealt with.

B). Teaching on Prayer.

Prayer is one of the essentials of all Christian life. One of the reasons for this is that in prayer is manifested in the clearest way man's endeavour to find God, and God's action in man, which latter is sometimes exercised with great force in the soul. Thus the *mystical* gifts crown the work begun by the *spiritual combat*. Important as is this teaching on prayer in any doctrine of spirituality, it is especially of moment in judging Cassian's teaching, since it has been said that he reduced the part played by grace.

¹ He invariably speaks of peace when treating of the perfect life and contemplation. In Conference I (7) he defines it; "*immobilis tranquillitas mentis at perpetua puritas*". See *ibid.*, 13; Conf. ix. 2; xxii, 3, etc.

In reality prayer takes a foremost place in Cassian's work; it forms the subject of several Conferences. "The whole edifice of virtue", says Abbot Isaac, "is raised only to obtain the *perfection of prayer*; should it not reach to this consummation, which unites and binds together all the parts, it will possess neither solidity nor lasting strength. Without the virtues it is impossible to acquire this peaceful and continual prayer, and without this prayer the virtues which form its base will never come to full perfection" ¹. A little further on, he distinguishes *four kinds of prayer*; the prayer which asks pardon for sin; the offering of vows and good resolutions to God; the ardent prayer for the salvation of souls; and, lastly, thanksgiving for past, present and future graces ².

These four kinds of prayer, which may give rise to other forms, are common to all; each one, however, *is given as the characteristic mark of a state of soul*; the last can only be reached by degrees, passing by the others in the order mentioned. "The first is especially suited to beginners who still feel anxiety and remorse for their faults. The second is for those who progress in virtue and gradually come nearer to God; the third, to those who keep their promises by good works, and who are moved by their own charity and the weakness of others to pray for them. The fourth, lastly, is only for those who, having uprooted from the soul all that is harmful, contemplate in peace and purity of soul the graces and mercy God has vouchsafed to them in the past, those they enjoy in the present and those He prepares for them in the future; they yield entirely to that violence of love, that *prayer offire* which transcends the expression and the understanding of man" ³.

Cassian continues this description of the prayer of fire, the perfect prayer. "The soul which attains and is firmly established in this degree of purity, begins to practice other forms of prayer; like a rapid and elusive flame it moves from 'me to the other; it offers up to God those prayers of unutterable perfection which the *Holy Ghost* with unspeakable roarings produces in us without our knowledge,* and conceives so many things at once that at some other time it finds

¹ *Conf.*, IX, 2.

² *Conf.*, IX, 9-10 and 11-14.

³ *Conf.*, IX, 15; *P. L.*, 49, 785-786.

⁴ Quas *ipse Spiritus* interpellans gemitibus inenarrabilibus (*Rom.* viii, 26) ignorantibus nobis, emittit ad Deum. /*biti*.

itself incapable not only of expressing them but even of remembering them " 1. This sublime prayer is here expressly attributed to the secret action of the *Holy Ghost*; Cassian explains his meaning even more clearly in his short commentary on the *Pater*[†]. He then shows what exercises best dispose the soul to the action of divine grace (recitation of the Psalms, exhortations, and the thought of death) and mentions what *forms* are taken by the interior emotions of the soul: unspeakable joy, spiritual transports, ecstasy, deep silence, astonishment, suspended action of the senses, groans and tears 3. Perfect prayer is again finely described in the following Conference (x) where it is successively characterised by anticipated beatitude (c. 6), by the fullness of union with God and a state of continual prayer (c. 7), and lastly by a perfect knowledge of the Scriptures (c. 11). Further, the author supplements the instruction given in the preceding Conference regarding the *means* of attaining perfect prayer: purity, recollection, etc. Cassian's insistency on the need of divine help in obtaining this gift of prayer, and man's powerlessness to obtain it by his own efforts, should be noted 4. This prayer, which was proposed as an end to each monk, was evidently highly mystical, since it went as far as ecstasy 5. It is the highest form of contemplation, which Cassian also terms *theory*, θεωρία. This latter supposes, in addition, the study of the Scriptures, which may be taken both as a necessary preparation to prayer or as its complement and result, since only the perfect possess a full spiritual understanding of the inspired word.

This teaching of the spiritual knowledge of the Scriptures is treated more fully by the Abbot Nestoros in the Conference XIV. To his mind, true penetration of the Divine Thought contained in Holy Writ is to be acquired less by study than by the practice of moral virtues; purity, silence, humility, peace, assiduous meditation, charity, and, before all, the Holy Ghost; it thus differs from merely profane knowledge. It is one thing, he says, to be able to express one-

[†] *Conf.*, IX, 15. — * *ConJ.*, IX, 18-25; *p. L.*, 49, 788-802. — 3 *Conf.*, ix, 26-27.

4 4 See in particular the long development on the usefulness of the expression: *Dens in adiutorium meum intende*, in ch. 10 of this Conference. *P. L.* an 831-839-.

5 Such is the sense of the expression *excessus*, *spiritus excessus*, *mentis excessus*, found in various parts of the Conferences: iv, 5; vi, 10; xix, 4. Saini Augustine uses the same expressions. *Enarr. in Psalm.* 67.

self with ease and eloquence, and another to be able to penetrate the meaning of heavenly things, and to contemplate in purity of heart secrets which no doctrine or teaching of man can impart, but which pure souls understand in the light of the Holy Ghost'. The same teaching is to be found in Conference XXIII on *perfect good*, the one necessary thing which, according to Theonas, is no other than contemplation: "This one and only thing is the contemplation of God, which must be placed above all merit, above all the virtues of the just, even above all that we read in Saint Paul of what is good and useful, and even of what is great and eminent"². Cassian considered Mary, the sister of Martha, as the symbol of contemplation³, and again, on this point, he is in agreement with Saint Augustine⁴, although he did not see eye to eye with him in all his theological teaching. But, as will be seen, Cassian was more at home in the domain of pure spirituality than in that of theology.

III. TEACHING ON GRACES.

Divine grace occupies a fairly large place in Cassian's spiritual teaching. He often affirms its necessity, and the assistance of the Holy Ghost, in particular, is shown to be indispensable for the practice of perfection, resistance to the passions, and the attainment of purity, etc. *Prayer*, which is so earnestly recommended to the monks, is not merely an *ascetic exercise* which teaches self-restraint and enables the soul to advance in virtue: it is essentially a plea for God's help. Nevertheless it must be avowed that Cassian gives too much importance to free will, especially in Conference xii on *divine assistance*⁵. His reputation as a scholar and a holy man lent great authority to his doctrine, and for nearly

¹ Aliud namque est facilitatem oris et nitorem habere sermonis, et aliud venas ac medullas caelestium intrare dictorum, ac profunda et abscondita sacramenta purissimo cordis oculo contemplari, quod nullatenus humana doctrina, nec eruditio secularis, sed sola puritas mentis per illuminationem Sancti Spiritus obtinebit. *Conf.*, XIV, 9. P. L., 49, 969. See above, *Général Introduction*, p. 28-30.

² *Conf.*, xxiii, 3. — > *Ibid.*

³ Saint Augustine treated these ideas especially in sermons 103, 104, 169, 179 and 255; P. L., 38. See below, p. 687.

⁴ See J. Laugier, *Saint Jean Cassien et sa doctrine sur la grâce*, Lyon, 1908. I. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, hi, p. 276-283.

⁵ *De protectione Dei*. P. L., 49, 897-948. Chapter 19. added to the text (col. 946-954), is an explanation of the Catholic doctrine of grace, written by Dionysius the Carthusian as a corrective.

a century it was to this authority that all those who opposed Saint Augustine's teaching appealed. Cassian had been sincere in his controversy with Pelagius; but his anxiety to give a firm basis to moral theology and asceticism led him to share the latter's error in some measure. Hence the name of Semi-Pelagianism which was later given to his teaching.

Cassian's system had at its root a certain confusion of the natural and the supernatural. He mistakenly thought that in the supernatural order man could achieve at least something by his own forces. Although he did not affirm, like Pelagius, that man was *healthy* in the order of grace, he would not admit, with Saint Augustine, that he was entirely *dead*; to his mind man is but *sick*. From the *integrity of free will*, which he *rightly* maintained, he wrongly deduced that man, *of himself*, could achieve something towards his sanctification; although he may not be able to realise it to the full, he is able at least to *desire* it "of himself". Thus the *initium fidei* (by good resolutions, pious aspirations, the least indications of good will), which God can of course produce in the soul, can also be *produced by the soul alone*, aided by its natural forces. In this case, *grace* would only follow the first movement of the heart² it would be not so much an *auxilium quo volumus*, as Saint Augustine puts it, as an *auxilium sine quo non* (perficimus)³. Grace is nevertheless interior and penetrates to the very soul, and in this Cassian differs from Pelagius: but its purpose is less to *cause an act of will* than to cause a perfect *act of will*, and from this aspect Cassian approaches Pelagius. As Tixeront says, the last word in the question of salvation is given to free will⁴. On the other hand, Cassian rightly insists on *God's will to save all men*: but he will hear nothing of that other aspect of the Divine Will (*consequent will*, by which God does not, *de facto* ⁵, will the salvation of all)⁶, which Augustine preferred to maintain, in order to abase human pride and to defend the teaching of the faith on the eternity of hell⁷. Cassian was

² *A scmetipso. Conf., XIII, 12, col. 925.* The expression, which might possibly be interpreted favourably, bears a dangerous meaning in the context.

³ *Ibid., ;<).*

⁴ J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

⁵ *Ibid., p. 279.*

⁶ This of course does not make the "antecedent will", just referred to, a mere concept without objective reality.

⁷ From his point of view this idea is a horrible blasphemy. *Conf., XIII, 7.*

¹ See ch. xvn, p. 690.

thus led to deny God's special regard for the elect; *predestination* was reduced to a mere prevision of merits'.

Several of Cassian's propositions were condemned by the Council of Orange (529) although he was not mentioned by name. It must be remembered that he did not speak as a theologian laying down a precise and coherent doctrine, but as an *ascetic* endeavouring to give practical guidance to his monks. This immediate purpose, although it does not excuse him entirely, partly explains his attitude to these serious questions. On all other points his spiritual doctrine is not only orthodox but also highly recommendable.

CHAPTER XVI.

Minor Theologians and Controversialists.

Special Bibliography : see the notes for each author.

I. NICETAS DE REMESIANA³ (375? — after 402).

To contemporary scholarship is due our knowledge of the attractive personality of Nicetas of Remesiana. Remesiana (Bela Palanka), where he was Bishop, was a small district of the old province of Dacia, in what we now call Serbia, to the East of Naissus (Nisch). He twice travelled to Italy (in 398 and 402). On each of these journeys he stopped at Noia to visit Paulinus, who gave him a warm welcome: the verses in which the poet wishes him a happy homeward journey are still extant (poem 17). Nicetas was a scholar with the soul of a missionary and an apostle. Although he lived in a region where the Greek and Latin civilisations touched, he gave his attention more

³ Cassian did not insist much on this point in his Conferences, but we know from two letters that Augustine received in 429 from two friends in Gaul (Prosper, *Ep.*, 225; Hilarius, *Ep.*, 226), what was taught in monastic circles in Provence at this time. Cassian's doctrine was predominant; their teaching was his. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 279-283. This teaching will be dealt with again below, with respect to Pelagianism.

Editions : Several of his works are to be found dispersed through *P. L.* See especially A. E. Burn's edit. *Nicetas of Remesiana*, Cambridge, 1905. Studies : A. E. Burn, *ibid.* W. A. Patin, *Nikola, Bischof von Remesiana*, Munich, 1909.

especially to Latin, which he wrote, if not with elegance, at least with clarity.

The list of his works would seem to be as follows, although all are not equally certain :

- 1) *Instructions to Catechumens* in 6 books.
- 2) *Two sermons* (ff) on Vigils and on the recitation of the Psalms '.
- 3) A writing, *Ad lapsam virginem* (probably the *De lapsu virginis consecrata*; found among Saint Ambrose's works)¹*
- 4) *De diversis appellationibus* (a little treatise on the names of Christ) '.

The most important of these writings is undoubtedly the collection of Instructions, although only two books of the six are now extant : the Hird, extant in two parts (*De ratione fidei*; *De Spiritus Sancti potentia*), and the Vth (*De symbolo*), which is one of the earliest and most important explanations of the Roman baptismal symbol : it may be compared with that of Rufinus of Aquileia. The error regarding the Holy Ghost was forcefully combated by Nicetas. Controversy nevertheless occupies but a minor place in his work. He was before all a *catechist*, a simplifier of doctrine, "simplici et nitido sermone"⁵.

Nicetas also composed *hymns* (now lost), and many modern critics, after Dom Morin, attribute to him the *Te Deum*^{6,7} " Thus, says Mgr Duchesne, this famous hymn, sung by the whole of Christendom on great occasions, seems to have resounded for the first time in an obscure corner of antique Moesia. It is the finest relic of those Churches which flourished in Roman times".

IL CONTEMPORARIES OF SAINT AMBROSE IN ITALY.

A). Famous Bishops.

I. *Philastrius*, Bishop of Brescia, is chiefly known for his *Liber de Harcibus*, written between 383-391. The author enumerates and describes 156 heresies : Saint Epiphanius in his famous *Panarion* gave but 80. Saint Augustine, who thought "Epiphanius far more learned than Philastrius", explains this disparity by differences as to the defi-

1 *Competentibus ad baptismum institutionis libelli sex.* P. L.^y 52, 847-876.]

2 P. L., 68, 365-376; 30, 232. — 3 P. L.^y 16, 367-384.

4 P. L., 52, 863-866. — 5 Gennadius, *De Viris ill.*, 22.

» 6 Dom Morin, *Revue bénéd.*, 1894, p. 49-77, 337-345. See also *ibid.*, 1907,; p. 180-223. More recently the 7^e *Deum* has been attributed to Saint Vincent of Lerins or to Prudentius.

7 P. L., 12, mi-1302. P. Oehler, *Corpus haresiologicum*, Berlin, 1856, T, p. 1-185.

dition of heresy. Philastrius is especially vague on the subject and his hook moreover has no literary value. For the first heresies he drew largely on Hippolytus' Syntagma: the account of the others seems to be his own work.

2. *Gaudentius*, Bishop of Brescia after Philastrius, left 19 sermons, of which the last is a panegyric of his predecessor¹.

3. *Saint Simplicianus* succeeded Ambrose at Milan; his many letters are unfortunately lost.

4. *Chromatius of Aquileia* left fragments on Saint Matthew (18 *tractatus* on c. iii, 15-17, c. v and vi)². The fine literary qualities of these fragments makes the loss of the work as a whole all the more regrettable.

B). Ambrosiaster 3.

Since the sixteenth century this name has been used to signify the author of a *Commentary on the Epistles of Saint Paul* (except the Epistle to the Hebrews), which in the majority of manuscripts is attributed to Saint Ambrose. The falsity of this attribution was first recognised by Erasmus, and it is now admitted by all critics³. It has also been shown that *Ambrosiaster* himself was the author of another work, *Questiones veteris et novi Testamenti* XXXVU. The identity of this writer is a mystery and is likely to remain so. Dom G. Morin, who has made a special study of the problem, first identified him (1899) with *Isaac*, a converted Jew who later became an apostate⁴. In 1904 he proposed on equally convincing grounds the name of a Prefect of Rome, *Decimus Hilarianus Hilarius*. Lastly, in 1914, he thought he had identified him in the person of Evagrius of Antioch, and gave good reasons for this hypothesis, for this opinion like the two preceding ones is still a hypothesis⁵.

As for the *Commentary on Saint Paul*, G. Bardy is of the opinion that it is "one of the most important, and perhaps the most important, left by Christian writers in Latin"⁶. The author uses no allegory; he endeavours to determine the literal sense and "keeps in view the moral formation of his readers... He calmly explains, expounds and enlightens, without any sudden flight or burst of genius"⁷. He has a certain leaning to criticise the conduct of the heads of the Church. To his mind, moreover, the oldest member of the priestly college had the right to the episcopacy⁸.

¹ P. L., 20. 827-1002. See Nirschl, *op. cit.*, n, p. 488-493.

² P. L., 20. 323-368.

³ See G. Bardy, *L'Ambrosiaster*, in *Diet. Bibl. (supplement)*, col. 225-241.

⁴ *Commentaria in XII Epistolas B. Pauli*, P. I., 17 (45-508), among Saint Ambrose's work.

⁵ A. Ballerini alone, in his edition of Saint Ambrose's work, maintained Ambrosiaster's authorship of the *Commentary*, 1883.

⁶ P. L., 35. 2213-2416, among Saint Augustine's apocrypha.

⁷ *Rev. hist. litt. rel.*, 1899, p. 97-121.

⁸ *Rev. béd.*, 1903, p. 113-131.

⁹ *Res. béd.*, p. 1-34.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, col. 238.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, col. 239.

¹² See Saint Jerome's opinion on this point, p. 589-590.

III. SAINT PACIANUS'.

Saint Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona (at the end of the fourth century), of whom Saint Jerome remarked that he was "castigatae eloquentiae et tam vita quam sermone clarus"¹ is chiefly famous for his refutation of Novatianism in his three *Letters to Sympronianus* and his *Exhortatorius libellus ad poenitentiam*.

Sympronianus had sent to the Saint his four opuscula in defence of the strictness of his sect. These were really based on Tertullian's *De Pudicitia*. In his letters, Pacianus refutes him and proves that the Church has the right to forgive all sins; a right which Jesus Christ gave to the Apostles and their successors, and which in no wise depends on the personal holiness of the minister⁴; a right which supposes true pardon and not only a mere declaration. Bishops who accord this pardon do so in virtue of "a power and a right, the *ius apostolicum*, originally given to the Apostles"⁵. Considering that at the time Pacianus wrote, this doctrinal problem had not yet been thrashed out, he indicates very clearly the very real nature of the pardon accorded by the Church⁶.

The *Exhortatorius libellus* contains a teaching similar to that of Saint Ambrose's *De Pcenitentia*. With equal firmness Saint Pacianus distinguishes two classes of sins: the *peccata* (ordinary sins) and the *crimina* (or *peccata mortalia, capitalia*), comprising apostasy, murder, fornication, and in addition "lesser faults which lead to them or are connected with them, such as instigation to murder, and any kind of impurity"⁸. He insists on the necessity of confession, made of course to a man, without false modesty, and public penance⁷.

Pacianus' other known writings are: a sermon on baptism⁹, probably a treatise against the Manichaeans {*De similitudine carnis peccati*}¹⁰ and a little work (not extant) against the Pagan masquerades on the first day of the new year, entitled *Cervulus*.

IV. PRISCILLIAN¹¹. HIS FRIENDS AND FOES.

Priscillian (340?-385), Bishop of Avila, lent his name to a heresy which concocted a body of doctrine from many early errors (Sabellian modalism, Docetism, Manichaeism)

¹ P. L., 13. Studies (in German) by A. Gruber, Munich, 1901, R. Kauek, Vienna, 1902. — ² *De Piris ill.*, 106. — ³ See above, p. 243.

⁴ This power derives *ex apostolico iure*: *Epist.*, I, 7.

⁵ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* p. 326.

⁶ A fine expression, which is often quoted, is found in the first letter: *Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero cognomen* (i, 4). Thus for him, as for Saint Optatus, Catholics alone are true Christians.

⁷ P. L., 13, 1081-1090. — ⁸ J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, 328.

⁹ His description is reminiscent of Tertullian's. See p. 242.

¹⁰ *De baptismo*, P. L., 13, 1089.

¹¹ See Dom G. Morin, in the Studies published at Maredsous, 1913, p. 81150.

¹² Works in *Corpus* of Vienna, 1889 (G. Schepss ed.). E. Ch. Babut, *Priscillien et le priscillianisme*, Paris, 1909. H. Kuenstle, *Antipriscilliania*, Freiburg im B., 1905. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, 231-243.

Huairism, and Encratism). After having ravaged the Spanish Church for many years, it was condemned by several Councils (Toledo 400, and especially Braga 563). A subtle and learned man, Priscillian began to attract attention by his new doctrine about 380. Having been condemned on several occasions, probably at the Council of Saragossa in 380, he finally appealed to Maximus, who had him put to death for immorality and the practice of magic. This execution caused great indignation throughout Christendom, and *Ithacius**, Bishop of Ossonoba, who had been a prime mover in the affair, was later excommunicated.

It may be wondered to what extent Priscillian himself taught the errors of the sect which bears his name, or at least formulated the principles from which they were drawn. His early adversaries in the fourth century had no doubt that he did, and what remains of his writings (fragment of a letter preserved by Orosius, and a synopsis — in 90 canons — of the Epistles of Saint Paul, revised by one of his disciples) confirm their assertion. Since the discovery of the eleven writings found at Wurtzburg, and edited by Schepps in 1889, a number of the charges brought against him may perhaps be modified, but these writings do not exculpate him entirely. Moreover, it is not quite certain that Priscillian was the author: Dom Morin attributed them in 1913 to another Priscillianist, *Instantius* 2. These writings contain a defence of the sect, a plea to Saint Damasus (381-382), a notice on the apocryphal books of the Old and the New Testament, seven homilies, and a liturgical prayer.

The chief Priscillianist writers were :

1. *Instantius* (mentioned above).
 2. *Diclinus*, Bishop of Astorga, author of a famous treatise, *The Scales (Libra)*.
 3. *Latronianus*, poet.
- Several treatises written by *anonymous authors*.

The chief adversaries of the sect, in addition to Ithacius, were : the Bishops of Olympius (beginning of the fifth century), *Pastor* and *Syagrius* (middle of the fifth century in Galicia), and *Turribius* (of Astorga, middle of the fifth century).

In 414 PAUL OROSIUS published an account of the errors of the Priscillianists and the Origenists (*Commonitorium de*

* He was a violent and sensual man, the enemy of all asceticism, which he regarded as heresy. — *Etudes, textes, (découvertes)*, I, Paris, 1913, p. 151-205.

errore priscillianistarum et origenistarum\ dedicated to Saint Augustine, whom he visited at Hippo about this time. This was followed by Augustine's *Liber ad Orosium contraprisillianistas et origenistas* (415). Priscillianism is herein refuted, but only in a summary fashion, since the matter had already been sufficiently treated in the Anti-Manichaean writings. In letter 237 (*Ad Ceretium*), Augustine takes the Priscillianists sharply to task on account of their impudent forgeries and their famous law : "jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli",

V. SAINT OPTATUS OF MILEVIS.

Saint Optatus, Bishop of Milevis in Numidia, is chiefly known for his capital intervention in the fight against Donatism at a time when, after Julian the Apostate, this heresy was beginning to revive, under the skilful leadership of Parmenianus.³ This intervention took the form of a treatise, *Contra Parmenianum*, or *De schismate Donatistarum*, which appeared about 366. The work, in six books, contains an appendix composed, between 330 and 347, of documents concerning the election of Caecilian;³ the author later added a seventh book. Saint Optatus' refutation is primarily based on history; but in two of the books he also treats, from a doctrinal aspect, the two points on which Catholics and Donatists were at variance, i. e., the nature of the true Church (bk. II) and the conditions of the validity of the Sacraments (bk. v). Optatus is "a pioneer in the theology of the Church and the Sacraments, and his ideas merit close attention. He did not base his controversy with Donatism merely on history and facts; he opposed to this heresy a doctrine of which the Bishop of Hippo's is but a development, and of which the principles were destined to be confirmed in a later age"⁴.

The Donatists regarded the *Church* as being primarily a *society of the just*: confusing the body with the soul of the

¹ Editions: P. L., 11, *Corpus* of Vienna, t. XXVI, 1893. Studies: P. Monceaux, *Saint Optat et les premiers écrivains donatistes*, Paris, 1920. P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de Saint Augustin*, Paris, 1920, p. 86-108.

³ See above, p. 390.

³ Saint Optatus made no distinction between Donatus of Casae Nigrae and Dtnatus of Carthage, and recent historians accede to this identification. It is also Monceaux's opinion. It would seem that the distinction of two persons was conceived by the Donatists themselves.

⁴ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, it, p. 257.

Church, the visible Church with the Church invisible, they excluded the sinner from its midst and regarded *holiness* as being the chief note of a true Christian society. Other characters were added by Parmenianus (*cathedra, angelus, spiritus, fons, sigillum*) which Optatus did not fail to claim for his own Church; but the Bishop of Milevis chiefly stressed the two great notes of the Church 1: *catholicity*, taken in a geographical sense, and as such not possessed by Donatism; *unity*, of which the Chair of Peter, established in Koine, is the one necessary centre; all the Churches of the world are united only by reason of their communion with Rome, and this union is manifested by the exchange of letters of communion (*commercio formatarum*). Optatus took Saint Cyprian's teaching on the unity of the Church and rendered it more precise and complete. As for the note of holiness which was so rashly claimed by the Donatists, Optatus proves that in this world it covers both the good and the wicked, since the Church is a "corpus mixtum" 2.

The Donatists practised re-baptism, which had been defended by Saint Cyprian, and made the *value of the Sacraments* 3 depend on the personal holiness of the minister. Although this especially affected baptism, Saint Optatus's answer has a general bearing. He distinguishes in baptism three elements of varying necessity: the Trinitarian formula, faith in the subject and in the minister. As regards the latter, Optatus is quite explicit: the ministers are but the instruments of Jesus Christ Who acts through them; the Sacraments are holy in themselves independently of the holiness of those who administer them. Optatus is less precise concerning the *faith of the subject*, and it may be wondered if he did not deny the validity of the baptism of heretics, on account of the lack of true faith in the subject. It is preferable to take the view that he did not sufficiently distinguish the *validity* of the Sacrament, for which a true intention suffices in baptism, from its *efficacy*, or production of grace, which also supposes faith and attrition in adults. This more precise teaching was added by Saint Augustine.

¹ See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.* J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dopni.*, n, p. 300-302.

The expression *Sanctorum comunitionem*, found for the first time in the fourth century, was perhaps invented by the Cathares (Novatians or others). In any case the Catholics gave it a different meaning and took it as indicating (the spiritual union of the members of the true Church. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. ti'm.*, It, p. 299. — 3 *Ibid.*, 308-311.

Saint Optatus was a true forerunner of the Doctor of Hippo, and that alone should suffice to bring him fame.

VI. FRIENDS AND DISCIPLES OF SAINT AUGUSTINE IN AFRICA.

It was in the nature of things, says Tixeront, that Saint Augustine's attractive and powerful personality should draw many friends and disciples to him. Paulus Orosius has already been mentioned. The following are those who have left some written document to posterity. 1

1. First, Aurelius, the great Bishop of Carthage, who died in 429. He was the author of a circular letter against the Pelagians, dating from 419".

2. Capreolus (d. 435), Aurelius' successor at Carthage, sent a letter (still extant) against Nestorius to the Council of Ephesus, and shortly afterwards refuted Nestorianism in an equally noteworthy letter entitled: "De una Christi veri Dei et hominis persona, contra recens damnatam haeresim Nestorii".

3. Evodius (d. 426), Bishop of Uzalis from 396 or 397, left a few letters³ and perhaps a treatise *On Faith against the Manichaeans*'.

4. Saint Alypius⁵, together with Possidius, was the most intimate of Saint Augustine's friends. Like Augustine he was a native of Tagaste, born in 354, a few years later than the great Doctor. In 374 he was Augustine's pupil at Tagaste. He followed him to Carthage, and met him again at Milan, now more as a friend than pupil, he shared his Manichaean errors, but remained chaste in the world and even helped Augustine to overcome his passions: he himself had been helped by Augustine to control a foolish infatuation for the games in the circus⁶. After Augustine's conversion, Alypius followed him to Cassilicum (Oct. 386-Mar. 387), where he acted as interlocutor in two of the philosophical opuscula written at this period (*Contra Academicos!* *De Ordine*). With Augustine he was baptised at Easter 387, followed him to Africa, shared his ascetic life at Tagaste about 390, and shortly afterwards was ordained at the same time at Hippo. About this time he went to Palestine, where he saw Saint Jerome at Bethlehem, and on his return talked of the latter's exegetical labours to Augustine. He was soon made Bishop of Tagaste, after 394, while Augustine was elected to the See of Hippo. The two bishops remained close friends for the rest of their lives, sharing their trials, their joys and their struggles. Saint Paulinus of Noia having asked Alypius to write him the story of his life, Saint Augustine feared that the biography of the Bishop of Hippo would figure more prominently therein than the life of the

¹ *De damnatione Pelagii atque Caelestii haeticorum*; P. L., 20, 1009-1014.

³ The two letters are in A. L., 53, 843-858.

³ In Saint Augustine's correspondence, and a letter edited by D. MOKINJ *Rev. benid.*, 1896, p. 481-486.

⁴ P. L., 42, 1139-1154.

⁵ See V. BARDET, *Un ami de saint Augustin*, in *Rev. August.*, 1904, t. IVI p. 56-62, 135-145, 228-243, 333-349. — ⁶ *Confess.*, bk. VI, c. VII-VIII, II-13. 1

Bishop of Tagaste : he therefore offered to write Alypius' life himself, but the letter written on this subject is now lost. Alypius probably died about 430. His literary work consists only in the part he took in the above mentioned dialogues.

5. Saint Possidius'. Saint Possidius declares in his life of Saint Augustine, that he knows some ten bishops who came from monasteries founded by the Bishop of Hippo : " Nam ferme decem, quos ipse novi, sanctos et venerabiles viros, continentes et doctissimos, beatus Augustinus diversis Ecclesiis, non nullis quoque eminentioribus, rogatus dedit " ¹. The author of this passage himself possessed all the qualities he attributed to his fellow bishops : he was the most loved among the friends of Augustine, with whom he lived in close contact for nearly forty years, first as a monk at Hippo, then as a priest of his church, and finally as Bishop of Calama, the most important See of Numidia, to which he was elected about 397. He was chosen, together with Augustine and Aurelius, to be one of the seven bishops to represent the Catholic Church before the Donatists at the conference of 411. He took part in all the religious struggles of his period by the side of his friend and master. In 430, having been harried out of Calama by the barbarians, he fled to Hippo, where he was present at the deathbed of Augustine. In 437 he was expelled from his See by the Arian, Gensericus. The exact date of his death is unknown.

Saint Possidius' chief glory is to have been the first biographer of the great Doctor. His *Life of Augustine* ³ is, together with the list of the books, treatises and letters ⁴ which he drew up, one of the most valuable documents we now possess on the apostolic labours and the virtues of the great bishop. It was written chiefly for the pious edification of the faithful, and although not particularly outstanding for beauty of style it is at least remarkable for its piety, the respectful admiration of the disciple and the sincerity of the narrator. It comprises 31 short chapters, eight of which deal with Augustine's life before his elevation to the episcopate (1-8), ten with his controversies with the heretics (9-18), nine with his virtues (19-27), and four with his last days and death (28-31). The author is a most trustworthy witness : " Quæ in codem vidi, ab eoque audiui, minime reticere debeo "; and he promises to be utterly sincere in his work : " Fide non ficta... <le prædicti venerabilis viri et exortu et procursu et debito fine, quæ per eum didici et expertus sum, quæ plurimis annis eius inhærens caritati, ut Dominus donaverit, explicandum suscepi " ⁵.

¹ Dom Ceillier, *Hist. gen. aut. sac.* t. IX, 562 sq. — ³ *Vita S. Aug.*, c. 9. P. L., 32, 33-66. Recent edit. by Weiskotten, Princeton, 1919.

⁴ *Indiculus librorum tractatum et epistolarum S. Augustini* ; P. L., 46, 5-22. *Vita S. Aug. præfatio*.

CHAPTER XVII.

Saint Augustine.

Special Bibliography on Saint Augustine.

1. Editions: P. L., 32-47 (The Benedictines, Blampin and Constant's edit., 1679-1700; with general preface by Mabillon). See A.-M.-P. INGOLD, *Histoire de l'édition bénédictine de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1903. The *Corpus* of Vienna has already published a new critical edition and many writings of Saint Augustine. *English translations*: Pusey "*Library 0) the Fathers*" (Oxford, 1839-55) contains translations of many works: the Confessions, sermons, treatises, expositions on the Psalms and "Homilies on John"; well supplemented by the "*Augustinian Library*" of Marcus Dodds (Edinburgh, 1872-76, 15 vols.), j These volumes with other translations reprinted by the editor, Dr. P. Schaff (New York, 1886-88). *French trans. of the Complete Works* by RAULX and Poujoulat, 17 vol., Bar-le-Duc, ('872; PÉRONNE and other collaborators, 32 vol., Paris, 1872. Other editions and special translations will be indicated in the notes.

Selected texts: F. Mayr, O. S. A. *Divus Augustinus, vitee spiritualis magister*, Pavia (18th cent.); *Fr. trans.*, P. Laurent, A. A., Paris, 1890. A. TONNA-BARTHET, O. S. A., *De vita Christiana libri VII*, Rome, 1917. L. Bertrand, *Les plus belles pages de saint Augustin*, Paris, 1914.

2. General Studies: Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs ecc.*, Paris, 1774, t. IX. Fessler Jungmann, *Institutiones patrologia*, t. π, p. 250-405. E. PORTALIÉ, *Augustin (saint)*, in *Diet, théol.*, col. 2268-2472 (I, Life: 2268-2286; II, Works: 2286-2317; III, Doctrine: 2317-2462H tv. Authority of S. Augustine: 2462-2472). Shorter study by same author in *Cath. Encyc.*, vol. n, p. 84-ro4 ('Seni. edit.). O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, t. iv, 1924, p. 434-511. P. de Labriolle, *Hist. lilt, lat. chrét.*, p. 519-564.

3. Histories and Biographies: In addition to S. Possidius (see: above, p. 611), Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, t. xii, Paris, 1710 (2nd edit.). On the latter's then unpublished notes was based the Benedictine's *Vita S. Aur. Augustini* (P. I., 32, 65-578). Poujoulat, *Histoire de S. Augustin, sa vie, ses œuvres, son siècle, influence de son génie*, Paris, 3 vol., 1845-1846 (2nd ed., 2 vol. 1852). Ad. Hatzfeld, *S. Augustin* (Coll. *Les Saints*), Paris, 1897. C. Woi.FSGRUBER, O. S. B., *Augustinus* (in German), Paderborn, 1898. G. V. Hertling, *Augustin* (in German), Mainz, 1902. L. Bertrand, *S. Augustin*, Paris, 1913; *Autour de S. Augustin*, Paris, 192a P. Guillox, *L'âme de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1922. C. Boyer, *Christianisme et néoplatonisme dans la formation de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1920, Protestant Lives: Fr. Bohringer, Zurich, 1845; 2nd ed., 2 vol., SKittgart, 1877-1878; C. BINDEMANN, 3 vol., Leipzig, 1844-1869.

4. Controversies: C. Douais, *S. Augustin contre le manichéisme de son temps*, Paris, 1895. P. MONCEAUX, *S. Augustin et le donatisme*

t. vu of the *Hist. liti. Afr. chrét.*), Paris, 1923. P. Batiffol, *Le catholicisme de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1920. L. de Mondadon, *Bible et Eglise dans l'apologétique de S. Augustin*, in *Rech. Sc. Rei.*, 1911, p. 209-239, 441-457, 546-569. Pet Au, *De pelagianorum et semipel. hceresi*, Paris, 1643. H. Norris, *Hist. pelagiana...*, Padua, 1673.

5. Philosophy : F. NOURISSON, *La philosophie de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1865. Card. Zigliara, O. P., *Delia luce intellettuale e dell'Ontologismo, secondo la dottrina dei sancti Agostino*, Bonaventura Tommaso, Rome, 1874, 2 vol. Grandgeorge, *S. Augustin et le néo-platonisme*, Paris, 1896. J. Martin, *S. Augustin*, (Coll., *Les grands philos.*), Paris, 1901. C. BOVER, *Vidée de Vérité dans la philosophie de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1920. Mgr Grabmann, *Die gottliche Grund der menschlichen Wahrheitserkenntniss nach Augustinus*, Münster, 1924. M. Geyser, *Aug. und Phenomenologische Religions-philosophie gegenwärtig*, Munster, 1923. G. COMBÈS, *S. Aug', et la culture classique*, Paris, 1927; *La doctrine politique de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1927.

6. The Exegete and Preacher : Bossuet, *La défense de la tradition et des SS. Pères* (against Richard Simon's *Hist. critique des commentateurs du Nouv. Test.*, 1793). Douais, *S. Aug. et la Bible* in *Rev. Bibl.*, 1893, p. 62-81, 351-377; 1894, 110-135, 410-432. COLINCAMP, *Etude critique sur l'œuvre oratoire de S. Aug'*, Paris, 1858. A. Regnier, *La latinité des sermons de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1887. A. Degert, *Quid ad mores ingeniaque afrorum cognoscenda conferant S. Aug. sermones*, Paris, 1894. See also G. Longhaye, *La prédication*, p. 149-186 (*Studies*, 1888, t. 43).

7. General studies on Saint Augustine's theology : In addition 10 Portalié, see Schwane, *Hist. des dogmes*, trans. Degert. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* t. II, p. 354-512. J. B. Faure, *Annotations in Enchiridion*, Rome, 1755 (2nd ed- 1847). See also all the great theologians.

8. Special subjects: C. Van Crombrugge, *La doctrine christologique et sotériologique de S. Aug. et ses rapports avec le néo-platonisme*, in *Rev. Hist. Eccl.*, 1904, 2 articles. J. Rivière, *Le dogme de la Rédemption*, ch. xv and xxn. O. RoTTMANNER, *Der Augustinismus*, Munich, 1892. J. Rivière, *La justification*, in *Diet. théol.*, col. 2098 sq. A. d'Alès, *El prédestination*, in *Diet. Apol.*, col. 205-216. G. Phillips, *la raison d'être du mal d'après S. Augustin* (Coll. *Museum Lessianum*), Louvain-Paris, 1927. P. Pourrat, *La théologie sacramentaire*, passim. P. Batiffol, *VEucharistie*, p. 422-453. E. Tarchier, *Le sacrement de l'Eucharistie d'après S. Augustin*, Lyon, 1904. M. BlEin, *Le sacrifice al l'Eucharistie d'après S. Aug.*, Lyon, 1906. F. Cayré, *La contemplation augustinienne*, Paris, 1927.

Moral and ascetic teaching: *Angelus Cupetoli* (G. Gualdo, 1 beatine), *Theologia contemplativa et moralis*, 3 in-fol., Aménice, 1737. (iROU, *Morale de S. Augustin, surtout d'après les Confessions et la Cité tir Dieu*, Paris, 1786. J. Martin, *Doctrine spirituelle de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1901. E. X. Eggf.RSDORFER, *Der h. Augustinus als Pädagoge und seine Bedeutung für die geschichte der Bildung*, Freiburg, 1907. Ma USBACH, *Die Ethik des h. Augustinus*, Freiburg, 1909. P. Pourrat, *La spiritualité chrétienne*, p. 270-344. B. ROLAND-GOSSELIN, *Im morale de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1925.

See, in addition, many articles in periodicals.

ARTICLE I. LIFE AND CONTROVERSIAL WORKS.

I. LIFE BEFORE BAPTISM (354-387).

Aurelius¹ Augustinus, the greatest Doctor of the Church, was born on the 13th November, 354, in Numidia at Tagaste (now Souk-Ahras, to the south of Bona) of a respectable middle-class family. Patricius², his father, was a Pagan and was baptised only on his deathbed in 371. Monica, his mother, was a Christian and was destined to exert a ruling influence in the guidance of his life. It is also known that he had a brother, Navigius, the father of two nuns in the convent near Hippo, which had as its superior one of Saint Augustine's sisters, whose name is unknown.

After having passed through the elementary *schools* at Tagaste, Augustine studied literature in the schools of Madaura (from 365 to 369). His sixteenth year was spent in idleness at Tagaste, what time his father scraped together sufficient money to send him to Carthage. Thanks to the support of his fellow-countryman, Romanianus, who was later to entrust him with the education of his son, Licentius, he eventually arrived in Carthage in 370. Here he spent four years immersed in the higher studies which opened the door to a forensic or teaching career³. Having achieved his studies at the age of twenty, he chose teaching as a career, in which profession he remained for twelve years, 374-386. He taught first at Tagaste, probably grammar. His countryman, Alypius, came to him here as a pupil, and shortly afterwards went with him to Carthage, where Augustine taught rhetoric for eight years (375-383). In 383 Augustine went to Italy, and after a short stay in Rome applied for

¹ This name, *Aurelius*, was given him by his contemporaries: Augustine never uses it himself.

² Although not a wealthy man, he was one of the *curiales* at Tagaste (member of the municipal council).

³ In the fourth century a complete course of studies comprised three stages: first, elementary, taught the child to write and calculate; from the age of twelve to sixteen years he was taught grammar and read the historians and poets; from sixteen to twenty he studied at the schools of the rhetors and philosophers! See Daremberg et Saglio, *Educatio*, in *Did. des Antiquités*, *it.*, p. 483. III Saint Augustine's *Confessions* may be found frequent reference to these three degrees of classical teaching (bk. I-III).

a professorship at Milan, obtained it, and was accepted by the prefect, Symmachus. He retained this post until September 386, when he resigned on account of ill health, and still more for reasons of conscience.

The meteoric career of the brilliant professor is not, externally, marked by anything especially outstanding. Its real interest lies entirely in the religious crisis which profoundly troubled Augustine during these years, and which he explained so feelingly and so sincerely in his immortal *Confessions*. It is all the more necessary to give a precise idea of the nature and progressive stages of this crisis inasmuch as it has suffered distortion at the hands of some recent critics.

A). The Fall. As a child Augustine was placed on the list of Catholic catechumens by his mother, who was careful to instruct him in the rudiments of religion'. This maternal education left him the impression, which he never lost, that Christ is the only means of salvation. But soon the name of Christ was almost all that he retained of his Christian up-bringing. This was due in great measure to the Pagan teaching of his masters at Madaura. The awakening of the passions during his critical sixteenth year emancipated him completely from his mother's influence. Both his faith and his morals suffered even more during his stay at Carthage². Augustine, nevertheless, was never as wild as his companions, and from 371-372, when he first met the mother of Adeodatus, to whom he remained faithful, he led a fairly regular life: this liaison, although condemned by the Church, was tolerated and even perhaps recognised by the State³. From 373, a year before finishing his studies, he was no longer a Christian except in name. He still went to church on certain feast days, but did not pray: he was wholly taken up by sensual love and worldly affairs. In such a frame of mind, teaching which was best calculated to be a source of good easily became a source of evil. Such was the case

¹ *Confess.*, bk. I. c. XI, 17. During an illness he asked to be baptised, but Saint Monica herself preferred to postpone it.

Two extremes must here be avoided: his confessions should not be exaggerated without thought of the feelings of the bishop who made them ten or twenty years later; but neither, for this reason, should the facts be denied altogether. The early rationalists fell into the former error; the moderns tend to adopt the second.

Concubinage was tolerated by the State; but not by the Church, as Loofs mentions.

of the doctrine of *wisdom*, with which he became acquainted at this time and which was for him the occasion of an even greater fall, even more dangerous from a religious point of view, for it degraded his mind.

He learnt of wisdom in Cicero's *Hortensius*. This dialogue, which he read at the age of nineteen, showed him that the search for truth is the only object in the pursuit of which life may be profitably spent. He was seized by the love of truth which he was never to lose. But this passion, so admirable in itself, troubled his first steps in quest of his ideal. The memory of the Christ of his mother moved him to open the Scriptures, but he was shocked by their very simplicity. The Manichaeans, on the contrary, specious talkers, who repeated incessantly "truth! truth!", who substituted knowledge for faith, and retained Christ in their system, won him over.²³ For nine years he adhered to this sect, but was never more than an auditor. Although he never accepted all their teaching he at least admitted their fundamental principles: all is matter, even God; evil is a separate and living substance; the human soul is part of the Divinity.³ He perceived many scientific objections to this teaching, but nevertheless placed his trust in the sect. He went to even greater lengths and with the neophyte's zeal attacked Christianity *miserrima et furiosissima loquacitate*.⁴ He converted! his friends Alypius, Romanus and others to his errors. His life sunk to the depths. His mother, who when he first returned from Carthage had closed her door to him, consented to receive him, but never ceased to weep for his disorderly life.⁶ Her tears were rewarded.

B). The Ascent. For a long time the Manichaeans succeeded in soothing Augustine's doubts and scruples by assuring him that Faustus, the famous Manichaean Bishop of Milevis, would be able to satisfy all his enquiries. Faustus came to Carthage in 382, and in reply to Augustine's questions could do no more than confess his ignorance?,

¹ *Confess.*, bk. in, c. iv, 7. — ² *Ibid.*, c. vi, 10 sq.

³ *Ibid.*, bk. in, c. vn, 12-14; bk. iv, c. xv, 24-27; bk. v, c. X, 18-20; bk. vn, c. iv, 6. — ⁴ *De dono persever.*, c. xx, 53.

⁵ For instance, that friend of whom he deplored the return to the Christian faith at the moment of death. *Confess.*, bk. iv, c. iv, 7-9.

⁶ *Confess.*, bk. in, c. XI-XU, 19-21. Fieri n' n Potei! ut »llus isiaruu-lacrimarum pereat", a holy bishop once said to Monica. *Ibid.*, c. xn, 21.

¹ *Confess.*, bk. v, c. V-VII, 8-13.

The spell was broken, and although Augustine did not immediately abandon the sect, his mind was filled with disgust at its doctrines. That passion for truth which had first caused him to embrace them was now to lead him gradually back to the faith of his childhood. But he was not to find the uphill path easy.

1. Although his rejection of Manichaeism, began with Faustus' avowals at Carthage in 382, and was strengthened by his observations of the immorality of the leaders of the sect at Rome in 383, Augustine did not break completely with the error until he heard Ambrose comment the Old Testament at Milan. The sound spiritual exegesis of the eminent bishop convinced him that Catholicism was not the ridiculous belief which the Manichaeans had led him to suppose¹. Without taking any definite step he again began to consider himself as a *catechumen of the Church* about 383. But this conversion was imperfect. After the Manichaean delusion he began to take an interest in the probabilism of the *New Academy* and this held him back from giving himself wholly to Christ. Although he never became a true sceptic, he wondered whether there existed any certain way to wisdom².

2. He made a distinct step in the right direction when, about 385, he realised that for full possession of truth an authority, distinct from reason alone, was necessary: the Scriptures or the Church. This was a tacit admission of the grounds of belief and the truth of the Catholic Church, and an implicit rejection of probabilism³. In short it was the conversion of the mind, which, says Boyer, must certainly be placed, not only before the incident of the garden but also before he read the Neo-Platonic philosophers in 385. Nevertheless, many intellectual difficulties still remained. Augustine had faith; but he lacked knowledge. In this pass, the writings of the Platonists (i. e. the Neo-Platonists, and chiefly Plotinus), which he read in the translations of the rhetor, Victorinus⁴, were of great help⁵ to him. They completed the slow but sure influence of Ambrose's preaching. He learnt, in particular, that all being is fundamentally good (and was thus able to refute the Manichaeans directly) and that there really existed incorporeal spiritual realities. The intelligible world of the Academy helped him to understand the doctrine of the Word. Moreover, when necessary, he used Christian teaching as a corrective to his reading. Unfortunately, useful as they were, the philosophers filled him with an intellectual pride and vanity which still kept him back⁶.

3. It was not until September 386 that he was wholly converted in heart and mind. The starting point of this new advance was a realisation of the meaning of the mystery of the *Incarnation*. When, about the beginning of 386, he understood that in Christ alone was to be found the true way of salvation, he was cured in great measure of his pride⁷.

¹ *Confess.*, bk. V, c. XIV, 24-25. — ² *Ibid.*, bk. Vi, c. iv, 6.

³ *Ibid.*, vi, c. V, 7. See Ch. Boyer, *of. cit.*, p. 60 sq.

⁴ On Marius Victorinus, see above, p. 331. — s *Conf.*, bk. vit, c. IX, 13.

⁶ See Ch. Boyer, *of. cit.*, p. 72-122.

⁷ *Confess.*, bk. VII, c. XVIII srj.

He was deeply moved by the Scriptures, especially Saint Paul which he read all this period. But he still shrank from the renunciation grace demanded of him. Influenced perhaps by philosophy and most certainly by the Gospels and Saint Paul, he felt himself attracted *towards the superior degrees of Christian life*, which implied, together with celibacy, the abandonment of his worldly career⁰. His carnal passions were the chief hindrance. The mother of Adeodatus had been dismissed and Monica¹ persuaded him to become betrothed in view of marriage. But Augustine took another concubine. During the whole of the year 386 he was torn between the nobler aspirations of his soul and the "weight" of the flesh*. The account of the conversion of the rhetor, Victorinus, made to him by the priest Simplicianus, revived his desires⁵, but did not decide him⁶. The lives of the monks (in Egypt — Saint Antony — at Trier, at Milan), told to him one day in September 386 by Pontitianus, an officer in the Imperial Palace, acted as the immediate preparation to grace⁷. Immediately after this visit he went into the garden, a prey to violent emotion, lacerated in mind and more distraught than he had ever been before⁸. After a period of anguished thought, he was moved by Providence⁹ to open the Scriptures, and his eye fell on a passage of Saint Paul's dealing with continence¹⁰. From that moment his troubles fell from him : his will became calm and strong. He abandoned all thoughts of marriage, and a few days later (end of September, 386) gave up his profession.

C). The Neophyte. Augustine wasted no time in going to Cassiciacum, near Milan, to the villa of his friend, Verecundus, where for several months, from October 386 until March 387, he reaped the benefits of solitude, restored his failing health and sought with his whole soul that union with God for which he had sacrificed all. Among those who accompanied him to this retreat may be especially mentioned, in addition to Monica, his friend, Alypius, and two other disciples, Licentius and Trygetius, whose names appear

¹ Saint Monica's discreet move in coming to live with Augustine at Milan must also be mentioned. Augustine had left Africa without her knowledge. *Confess.*, bk. V, c. viii, 14-15.

- *Confess.*, bk. vi, c. xi, 18-20. J. Martin, *Doctrine spirit.*, p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, bk. vi, c. xiii, 23.

⁴ Pondus hoc, consuetudo carnalis. *Confess.*, bk. VII, c. XVII, 23. My old loves "plucked at my fleshly garment, *succutiebant vestem meam carnem*", he declared. *Ibid.*, bk. viii, c. XI, 26.

⁵ *Ibid.*, bk. viii, c. i-iv, 1-9.

⁶ *Ibid.*, bk. viii, c. V, 10-12. Admirable description of the struggle between the spiritual and the carnal man.

⁷ *Confess.*, bk. viii, c. vi-vii, 13-18.

⁸ *Ibid.*, c. viii-xi, 19-27.

⁹ He heard a child's voice crying : Tolle, lege; tolle, lege. *Ibid.*, c. xii, 29.

¹⁰ Non in comessationibus et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus et impudiciis, non in contentione et æmulatione; sed induite Dominum Jesum Christum, et carnis providentiam ne feceritis in concupiscentiis". *Rom.*, xii, 13-14.

in the dialogues.* Philosophy occupied a large place in the deliberations of the little circle. Augustine continued the education of his young pupils by means of philosophical conversations, with them or with Alypius. These are transmitted faithfully in the dialogues, *Contra Academicos*, *De beata vita*, *De ordine*, which date from this period. The *Soliloquies*, which contain Augustine's personal meditations, may be classed with the above as regards their general tendency.

For the last thirty years certain critics have concluded from the examination of these writings that at this time Augustine was converted only to Neo-Platonism, and that it was only later, about 390, that he truly embraced Christianity'. *But this thesis cannot be maintained.* Not only the text of the *Confessions* and the fact of his baptism in 387 are totally at variance with it, but even the writings composed at Cassiciacum prove the faith in Christ and the Christian piety which animated the whole group. Even the philosophy in question "is synonymous with Christian life, Christian contemplation, or simply Christianity", says Boyer³. Moreover, it had for its object the very bases of religion (certitude, happiness in God, Providence). For Augustine it was but a means for union with God. It is true that the tone of these writings, including the *Soliloquies*, differs from that of the *Confessions*: it should be remembered that Augustine had not yet attained the summits of perfection as he had ten years later (as yet, he was not even baptised!), but he was tending to those heights with his whole soul. It may be, also, that he counted too much on the efficacy of his philosophical effort to attain a state of peace, of which he exaggerated the perfection. In the *Retractations* he corrected certain desires that he nourished at this time; he denied especially that it is possible to achieve true happiness in this world through wisdom alone.

Saint Augustine informed Saint Ambrose by letter, of his new resolution and his state of soul. The Bishop of Milan had advised him to read Isaias. He returned to Milan in Lent 387 and had himself inscribed among the *competentes*, and together with Adeodatus was baptised⁴ at Easter by the great Bishop who, by the charm of his eloquence and the

* The group was made up of 9 persons. *De beata vita*, 6. Licentius was the son of Romanianus, and Trygetius was another young companion from Tagaste. At Cassiciacum with Augustine were also his son, Adeodatus, his brother, Navigius, and two young cousins. For the stay at Cassiciacum, see *Confess.*, bk. IX, c. III-IV.

• Position insinuated by Harnack, presented by Loofs (*Realencyclopädie*, II, 1897), defended at length by the Protestant, L. Gourdon (Cahors, 1900), W. Thimine (Berlin, 1908), and re-stated by P. Aïfaric, *Dévolution intellectuelle de S. Augustin: I. Du Manichéisme au néoplatonisme*, Paris, 1918 (copiously documented work, but biased). See E. PoRTAi.É, *op. cit.*, 2273-2275. Cf. Boyer, *op. cit.*, (the whole work is devoted to refuting the critical thesis).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

⁴ *Confess.*, bk. IX, c. V-VI, 13-14.

nobleness of his thought, had discreetly and unconsciously prepared the return to the Church of him who was destined to be its most powerful Doctor.

II. LIFE AFTER BAPTISM (387-430). GENERAL OUTLINE.

Saint Augustine does not seem to have left Milan immediately after his baptism. In the autumn of 387, when he was at Ostia ready to leave for Africa, Saint Monica died, after having had the consolation not only of bringing him back to the faith, but of being associated with him at Ostia in one of these supernatural graces which God vouchsafes to chosen souls.* “Inali literature”, says Portalié, “there are no pages of more exquisite sentiment than the story of her saintly death and Augustine’s grief”²³. After his loss he prolonged his stay in Italy, at Rome.

Returning to *Pagaste* at the end of 388, he sold all his goods, and gave the proceeds to the poor, and founded a monastery on one of his estates which had already been alienated³. Called to the priesthood unexpectedly at Hippo (beginning of 391), he consoled himself for the loss of his retired life by founding another monastery on some property belonging to the Church. Valerius, the Bishop, unable to preach himself, confided this duty to Augustine⁵. During these first years of his priesthood he refuted the Manichaeans, took part in the Plenary Council of Africa⁶, held at Hippo in 393, and abolished the abuse of holding banquets in the chapels of the martyrs⁷. In 395 Bishop Valerius associated Augustine with himself as coadjutor, and on his death, which took place in the following year, Augustine succeeded him in the See of Hippo.

The new Bishop was now forty-two years old. During the years which had passed since his conversion, his soul had attained to that *high degree of moral purity* we perceive in the *Confessions* (written at the beginning of his episcopate). United to God by charity, in interior peace and joy, he was

* *Ibid.*, c. X, 23-26.

³ *Ibid.*, c. vnt-xiti, 17-37. E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, 2275.

⁴ *Epist.* 126, n. 7; 157, n. 39; and *Epist.* 17, n. 5.

⁵ *Serm.* 355, n. 2.

⁶ The summary of this preaching is to be found in the *De Genesi ad lilt. Libes imperſttus*, and the *De Sermone Domini in monte*. See p. 654-655.

⁷ Where he made an important speech, which with additions has become the *De fide et symbolo*. P. L., 40, 181-192. — *Etnst.* 22 and 29.

now able to develop his famous distinction between *frui* and «*Zi 24*» which forms the core of the first book of the *De Doctrina Christiana*, written at this time: "Frui enitn est amore alicui rei inhærere propter seipsam... Res quibus fruendum est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus... solo Deo fruendum... cæteris autem utendum est"³. Augustine's union with God was accompanied by most intense supernatural enlightenment on the most profound mysteries, especially that of the Trinity, which for the fifteen years after 400 formed the subject of his daily meditation⁴. It was at this time also that he realised the necessity of attributing to God everything implied in the work of justification, even the *initium salutis*⁵, which, in certain of his previous writings, which the Semi-Pelagians later turned to their own advantage, he had thought possible to attribute to man alone.

On becoming bishop, Augustine changed nothing in his way of life. He was especially attached to the monastic life. He turned his episcopal house into a monastery and submitted his clergy to the practice of poverty and a religious rule. Many of his disciples, some of whom became bishops (Alypius at Tagaste, Severus at Milevis, Evodius at Uzala, Urbanus at Sicca, Profugus at Cirta, etc.), and others who remained simple monks, established similar monasteries in various dioceses. Augustine was thus, at the same time, the patriarch of the religious life in North Africa as well as a reformer of the clergy. The Vandal invasion about 430 partly destroyed this great work. It is futile to wonder whether Augustine founded an Order of regular clerics or of monks, or the two successively, since such a distinction was unknown in the fifth century. What he established was the *religious life* in its coenobitic form⁶. The rule followed in these monasteries is unknown. But its essential elements seem to be contained in two sermons entitled: *De vita et moribus clericorum suorum* (*Serm.*, 355-356)⁷. Moreover, l'ossidius mentions, among the holy bishop's more outstand-

³ The traits which follow will again be discussed in the section on Augustine's doctrine; they are mentioned here as having a particular psychological interest with regard to the opening years of his episcopacy.

Already put forward in the *De quasi.*, LXXXIII, q. 30.

⁴ *Deduct. christ.*, bk. I, c. IV, v, XXII.

⁵ *De Trinit.*, bk. I, c. III, 5.

⁶ *De div. quart. ad Simplicianum.* See p. 682.

⁷ See J. Besse, *Augustin (Règle de saint)*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 2472 sq.

⁸ *P. I.*... 39, 1568-1574, 1574-1581. See art. iv, p. 702.

ing virtues, his extreme poverty, and simplicity in all things/ his strict austerity and his charity which went to the extent of selling the sacred vessels in order to ransom captives; such must also have been the qualities he expected in his monks. To this ideal corresponds the famous *letter 211* written in 423 and which has since become the *Rule of Saint Augustine*. In this letter, which was written for a convent of nuns in his diocese of which his sister was superior, the Bishop outlines "a general line of conduct, which is characterised by admirable discretion and a broadmindedness truly worthy of his genius"²³ The adaptation of this letter for monks dates from before the sixth century.

With his interior life as a monk Saint Augustine combined an extraordinary activity in the most varied fields. 1) The duty of *administering* his diocese laid heavy cares upon him and took much of his time; in spite of his little interest in building he was obliged to undertake or arrange for the construction of an almshouse for the poor and various basilicas (at least five)³. 2) Although he found *preaching* a burden, inasmuch as it took him away from meditation⁴, he preached incessantly, giving great care to catechising the poor and ignorant. 3) His *writings* are innumerable; letters, opuscula and great works, destined for the faithful of all ranks and condition in every country, who came to him for counsel. 4) He took an active part in many African *Councils*, for the most part presided by his friend, Aurelius, the great Bishop of Carthage; the chief of these were held at Carthage in 397, 401, 404, 418, 419, and at Milevis 416. 5) Lastly, he *combated heresy*, especially Manichaeism, Donatisti) and Pelagianism. His activity in this doctrinal field will be treated in greater detail.

III. FIGHT AGAINST MANICHAISM s.

But a short time elapsed after Saint Augustine's conversion before he attacked Manichaeism, which had become so firmly rooted in Latin Africa, and which had kept back

¹ *Epist.* 211; *P. L.*, 33, 958-965. Numbers 5-15 (*ibid.*, col. 960-965) have been adapted for monks. This adapted text is found in *P. L.*, 32, 1377-1384.

² J. Bessb, *Augustin (Règle de saint)*, in *Dia. théol.*, col. 2473.

³ *Epist.* 126, 10, *De opere mon.*, c. XXIX, 37. — 4 *Senn.* 339, 4.

⁵ Saint Augustine's writings against Manichaeism will be found in *P. L.*, 42, save two (*De Moribus, De libero arbitrio*) which, with the philosophical dialogue», are in *P. L.*, 32, and the *De Genesi* in *P. L.*, 34.

Augustine himself from Christ. Just as previously he had Won over his friends to the heresy, he now set himself to win back those he had seduced. His first care was to unmask the false virtue of the sect by contrasting Christian doctrine add morality with the hypocritical austerity of the Manichæan "elect". Such is the purpose of the treatise *De moribus l*, in two books. Book I is a veritable treatise on Christian morality; Augustine proves that God is the sovereign good, describes finely our union with Him by charity, of which the four moral virtues form but one special aspect, and holds up to admiration the Christian virtues as seen in religious, the clergy and the laity. In Book II he refutes the Manichæan principles of the origin of evil, combats their false asceticism (*signacula oris, manus, sinus*), and denounces the scabrous conduct of their leaders. On his return to Africa, he supplemented this refutation by means of an explanation of the first three chapters of Genesis². At a later date he reproached himself with having made too large a use of the allegorical sense in this controversial work.

As a priest, Augustine carried on this struggle with brilliant success, especially in his debates. His first great victory was the debate (28-29 August, 392) with one of the Manichæan leaders, *Fortunatus*, on the nature of evil. Fortunatus, reduced to silence on the second day, fled in shame from Hippo³. Twelve years later (404), *Felix*, one of the Manichæan elect, reputedly very wise, invited to debate with Augustine, was also vanquished after one day's discussion : he at once became a Catholic⁴. This victory became widely known and contributed in a large measure to the weakening of Manichæism.

Meanwhile Augustine had refuted the great Manichæan doctors in his writings; first, *Adimantus* a disciple of Manes (3rd cent.), on the supposed contradictions between the two Testaments (about 394); shortly afterwards he refuted *Manes himself* by attacking one of his fundamental treatises⁵, which contained his radical teaching on the two principles ; the creation, and the origin of evil. After 400 he refuted *Faustus of Milevis*⁶, who had just published a great indictment against the Christian Bible : Augustine dealt with his arguments, point by point,

¹ *De moribus Ecclesiæ Catholicæ et de moribus Manichæorum*; *P. L.*, 32, 1309-1378.

² *De Genesi contra Manichæos*, 2 books; *P. L.*, 34, 173-220. In this controversy may also be classed the *De vera religione*. See p. 644.

³ *Acta seu disputatio contra Fortunatum man.*; *P. L.*, 42, in-130.

⁴ *De actis cum Felice man.*; *P. L.*, 42, 519-552.

⁵ *Contra Adimantum, Manichæi discipulum*; *P. L.*, 42, 129-172.

⁶ This is a treatise rather than a letter (sec p. 171 n. 1) although Augustine calls it a letter in his work *Contra epistolam Manichæi quam vocant fundamenti*; *P. L.*, 42, 173-206.

Contra Faustum manichæum libri XXXIII; *P. L.*, 42, 207-518.

in the course of the 33 books of his long and vigorous refutation, which consisted in a defence of Judaism as well as of Christianity. In 405 he sent an opusculum to *Secundinus*, a Roman who had embraced Manichaeism and who sought to win Augustine back to the sect. Augustine considered this work the best he had written on the subject¹.

It would seem, however, that from our point of view the works which are most representative of his philosophical outlook are the following : the *De libero arbitrio*², a dialogue in three books, begun at Rome in 388 (bk. I), completed at Hippo before 395 (bks. II and III), showing that the source of moral evil resides in freewill; later, the Pelagians endeavoured, unsuccessfully and mistakenly, to use his forceful argument in their own favour³; the *De duabus animabus* (391-392) denied the existence of two souls, one emanating from the good principle and the other from the evil; the *De natura bonis* (404) appears to be the best summary of Augustine's anti-Manichaean teaching: all being, whether material or immaterial, is essentially good, since God is its author; evil is always a privation; it is impossible to conceive of a principle of things essentially evil. Saint Augustine went to the frankly idealist Platonic philosophy for the rational principles by which he refuted the gross materialism of the Manichaeans. Later he praised this School for having realised that God is not a corporeal being : *nullum corpus esse Deum* 6.

With these works against Manichaeism may also be classed two later works : one, addressed to Paulus Orosius, *Against the Priscillianists*⁴; the other a refutation of an adversary of the Old Testament, probably a Marcionite, who, by means of an anonymous pamphlet distributed at Hippo, attributed to the devil the Old Testament and the whole work of creation⁵.

¹ Contra Secundinum manichaeum ; *P. L.*, 42, 577-602.

- De libero arbitrio libri tres; *I. L.*, 32, 1221-1310.

³ Saint Augustine protested against this abuse of his argument in *Retract.*, bk. I, c. IX, 3-6. See also *De natura et gratia*, c. LXVII, 80-81; *De dono persero*. *A. X.*, 26-30.

⁴ Liber de duabus animabus; *P. L.*, 42, 93-112.

- Liber de natura boni contra Manichaeos; *P. L.*, 42, 551-572.

⁶ *De Civ. Dei*, bk. VIII, c. vi. See p. 640-642 for Saint Augustine's philosophy.

⁷ Liber ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas; *P. J.*, 42, 669-678. See above. As regards the Origenist question, Augustine did no more than send Orosius his letter 166 (to Jerome).

⁸ Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum; *P. L.*, 42, 603-666.

IV. THE FIGHT AGAINST DONATISM.

Neither Optatus' refutation of Donatism nor the attempts to repress the African schismatics made by Valentian and Gratian, nor even the split which divided Maximinians and Primianists into two camps (followers of Maximian and Primianus, two rivals for the mantle of Parmenianus) was successful in putting an end to the schism before Augustine was raised to the See of Hippo.

Already while he was still a priest he had endeavoured to refute the Donatists by means of a rhythmic song (the oldest of its kind) in 240 lines, destined for popular use; this is the *Psalmus contra partem Donati* it is also termed the *alphabetic psalm*, since each of its twelve-line strophes begins with a letter chosen in alphabetical order. In this work the author refutes Donatism by the history of its beginnings and its practices; he invites the schismatics to return to the Church; towards the end of the song, the Church herself calls on them, in a noble and moving appeal, which in spite of the ruggedness of the style is a fine example of Augustine's emotional manner⁴.*

On becoming Bishop of Hippo he lost no time in entering into relations with the Donatist bishops, in the hope of leading them to see their error by means of friendly persuasion. The Donatist Bishop of Hippo, *Proculeianus*, having suggested a debate, Augustine gladly accepted, but Proculeianus soon changed his mind. He was more fortunate in his dealings with *Fortunius*, the Donatist Bishop of Tubursicum, but as the debate took place in the presence of an unruly crowd, prompt to heckle the speakers, it resulted in no satisfactory conclusion⁶.* An urgent letter sent by Augustine to *Honoratus*, a bishop not far from Hippo, seems to have remained unanswered. He also tried, but in vain, to provoke a debate with *Crispinus*, the Bishop of Calama, whom at a later date he was forced to threaten with legal action on account of the crimes he had committed against the Catholics, even in the diocese of Hippo⁸.

About 400, Augustine began to study methodically the *two points which were controverted* between the Catholics and the Donatists, i. e. the Church and the Sacraments.

1 All the anti-Donatist writings are to be found in 43. See especially P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*; P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 125-348; J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 384-59; E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2277-2280 and 2294-2296.

3 See above, p. 605-607.

• *Psalmus contra partem Donati*; *Λ L.*, 43, 23-32.

4 *Le Catholicisme de S. Augustin*, p. 133.

5 *Epist.* 33. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 137-141.

6 *Epist.* 44. See *ibid.*, p. 141-145.

7 *Epist.* 49. See *ibid.*, p. 145-146.

8 *Epist.* 51 (year 399); *Ep.* 76 (403). See *ibid.*, p. 146-148.

The first of these, the Church, forms the subject of a long treatise, *Against the letter of Pammenianus* * to Tychonius -I This letter, which is really a veritable work in three book/ (378), explained in all its details the official schismatic doctrine on the Church, for Tychonius had frankly admitted that in this world the Church is a mixed society and must necessarily be universal. On both these points Augusti® takes up the defence of the Church and clearly exposes the Catholic point of view. According to his usual method, he adopts the division of the work he is refuting, the better to follow the argument. The first book contains the Catholic arguments; in principle the holiness of the universal Church is not compromised by the defection of some of its members; in practice, the charges made by the first Donatists against the African Catholics are not proved 3; as for the strict action taken by the princes against the Donatists, it is justified 4, and gives no excuse to the latter to look upon themselves as martyrs for a holy cause : they were punished for their crimes 5. In books II and III Augustine examines the texts cited by the Donatists and interprets them in favour of the Catholic conception of the Church, especially her holiness and universality. Here are a few of the more Outstanding points : the Donatists, while declaring themselves all to be holy, overlook and even tolerate the crimes of their members 6* The true Catholic spirit provides a great safeguard 7. It is impossible that all the just should quit the Church and leave behind only sinners; it is even less possible that the just should abandon the Church, for one does not separate oneself from the Church except for reasons of pride, jealousy or depravity 8.

* *Contra epistolam Parmeniani libri III* ; A Z., 43, 33-108.

2 See above, p. 391.

3 Saint Augustine gives but little space to the historical aspect, already treated by Saint Optatus : see p. 608.

4 *Contra epist. Farm.*, I, 10, 16. Here, for the first time, the Bishop expressly admits the interference of the secular power in religious questions.

5 See *Contra Cresconium* : " Martyrem non facit pœna sed causa"; III, 51.

6 *Contra ep. Farm.*, III, 18, 26.

7 Quapropter securus judicat orbis terrarum bonos non esse, qui se dividunt ah orbe terrarum in quacumque parte terrarum. *Ibid.*, III (end). This inspiring expression was responsible for the beginning of Newman's conversion. See P. Thureau-Dangin, *La Renaissance cath. en Angleterre au XIX^e siècle*, (1913), p. 18[^]-182.

8 *Ibid.*, III, 28.

The other point, which concerns the Sacraments, is dealt with in the 7 books *De baptismo* which are intended to deprive the Donatists of Saint Cyprian's authority. Augustine affirms that the baptism administered by heretics is valid and impresses a character; but from this the Donatists should not conclude that the Holy Ghost is with them, since they are temporarily deprived of grace owing to the absence of the requisite moral conditions²; in a word, as long as this obstacle remains their baptism is valid but not efficacious. (It should be noted that this argument is given in rather a downright fashion)³. Augustine went even farther, and proved that Saint Cyprian, in spite of his partial error, was not separated from Catholic unity, from that universal Church of which he was "a member impossible to uproot"⁴.

The chief apologist of Donatism was Petilianus, Bishop of Cirta, a one-time lawyer, born of Catholic parents and later converted to the schism. About 400 he sent a letter to his priests against the Catholics and their doctrine on the Church and the Sacraments. On learning this Augustine addressed a pastoral letter to his flock to put them on their guard (bk. I of the *Contra litteras Petilianæ*)*; shortly afterwards (401) he refuted the letter in detail (bk. II, in 108 chaps.). Petilianus having replied in an insolent letter, Augustine brought out a third book (402) which, for the time at least, reduced his adversary to silence, both on doctrinal and personal matters. The *De unitate Ecclesiæ*, written during the controversy with Petilianus, in 401, is of doubtful authenticity. The four books against Cresconius⁸, an advocate of Cirta, who took up the defence of his bishop, is only a repetition of the refutation of the latter. About 410 Petilianus again attacked on the baptismal question. Augustine did not hesitate to repeat his arguments in a new treatise on baptism⁹.

¹ *De baptismo contra Donatistas*; *P. L.*, 43, 107-244. The *De unico baptismo* should be compared with this (*P. L.*, 43, 595-614), mentioned below. See also the little treatise — or rather sermon — *De baptismo contra Donatistas*, edited by Dom Wilmar, in *Rev. Unid.*, 1912, p. 157-160.

² Charity is destroyed by the spirit of schism. *De bapt.*, I, 18. See P. Batiffol, *Op. cit.*, p. 160-162.

³ It is exaggerated to suppose that every heretic or schismatic is a badly disposed subject.

⁴ *Inevulsibile membrum. De bapt.*, in, 14. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 162-167. Augustine only apparently begs the question. His argument supposes that for a local tradition to be lawful it must be in accord with the tradition of the whole Church, so that the unity of the Church is not affected.

See above, p. 391. Cf. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 168 sq.

Contra litteras Petilianæ; *P. L.*, 43, 245-388.

De unitate Ecclesiæ, or *Ad Catholicos epistola contra Donatistas*; *P. L.*, 43, 391-446.

Contra Cresconium; *P. L.*, 43, 445-594.

De unico baptismo. Contra Petilianum; *P. L.*, 43, 595-614.

In the struggle against Donatism must be mentioned/ in addition to this doctrinal action, the intervention of the secular power, with regard to which, Augustine's attitude suffered a change. Although he had always realised that the Church had the right to State protection, at the beginning of his episcopate he held decided views on *practical tolerance*.¹ he seemed to be averse to the application of the laws against the heretics, although he admitted their legitimacy and usefulness. Gradually, however, he began to ask for the active intervention of the State, and this for a double purpose²; first, to facilitate the discussions and negotiations which had been hindered by the evident ill will of certain persons, and secondly, to put down the violence of the Circumcellions (then more outrageous than ever). In fact, the evolution of Augustine's attitude is explained and justified by the crimes of the Donatists⁴. And in this matter the whole African episcopate followed his example. The latter, at the Council of 403, had officially invited the Donatist bishops to debate. The only answer consisted in an increase of violence on the part of the heretics, to such an extent that the ixth Council of Carthage (404) requested the Emperor, Honorius, to take vigorous action. The latter, already informed by his magistrates, took the initiative and imposed a fine of ten golden pounds for each act of violence. Later (in 405) the State began to deprive the Donatists of their churches. The execution of these measures of coercion was carried out somewhat half-heartedly, for the Donatists put up a lively resistance⁵.

In order to put an end to this turbulent faction, Honorius, in 410, decided that a Council of the two episcopates should take place. This meeting was held on the 1st, 3rd and 8th June, 411, at Carthage, in the presence of the Tribune, Marcellinus, who decided in favour of the Catholics on every point⁶. Among the 279 Donatist bishops the most outstanding were Petilianus and Primianus of Carthage, whilst Augustine and Aurelius of Carthage led the Catholic bishops. After two sessions, rendered entirely

¹ See below, art. IV, p. 706.

P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

² See above, p. 390.

³ See P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 218-229.

⁴ E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, 2278-2279. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, 293-304.

⁵ S. Augustine, *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis*; *P. L.*, 43, 613-650,

inconclusive by the obstructionist tactics of the Donatists, Augustine, who until then had taken little part in the debates, although in reality he had directed them all, was finally able to come to the essential question, in a public discussion on the *causa Ecclesia*. The Catholics were victorious and their victory was due to Augustine*. The legal suppression of Donatism followed closely on the conference (June 26, 411). The Catholic bishops set themselves to the task of rallying the leaderless schismatics. This in particular was the purpose of Augustine's eloquent *Ad Donatistas post collationem* in 412. The greater number of the Donatist bishops dispersed or were converted; some remained obdurate. About 418, Augustine again tried, but in vain, to convert Emeritus³, the Bishop of Caesarea; and about 420 was forced to refute Gaudentius, the Bishop of Timgad, who taught that suicide was preferable to submission to the Imperial laws⁴. The last Donatists had disappeared by the end of the century.

In his letters, Saint Augustine often defended the rigorous measures taken by the secular power after 405, and especially after 411 s. Seeing the fortunate results of the suppression, he even developed a theory of coercion, based on the *compelle intrare* of the Gospel⁶*. It was not properly a case of forced conversion to be imposed on all and sundry, but a correction⁷ to be applied to factions which troubled and endangered social and religious order. This theory must not be taken entirely independently of the particular circumstances which occasioned it. Augustine's general teaching, like that of the Church, is more complex⁸.

* P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

† Liber ad Donatistas post collationem; *P. I.*... 43, 651-690.

Sermo ad Cæsariensis Ecclesiæ plebem, Emerito præsentē habitus; *J. L.*, 43, 689-698. Gesta cum Emerito; *P. L.*, 43, 697-706.

‡ Contra Gaudentium : *P. L.*, 43, 707-752.

§ *Epist.* 86, 87, 89, 93, 97, 100, 105, 133, 134, 173, 185, 204.

¶ Chiefly in his letter 185 or Liber de correctione Donatistarum, in 417; *P. L.* 337 792-815. See n. 23, 24.

In 401 he had already written : “ *Ad fidem quidem nullus est cogendus invitata, sed per severitatem, imo et per misericordiam Dei, tribulationum flagellis let perfidia castigari;... si quæ igitur adversus vos leges constituere sunt, non eis i. nefacere cogimini, sed male facere prohibemini* ”. *Cent. litt. Petii.*, n. 184.

See art. iv, p. 707. Saint Augustine's attitude is explained with palatable differences by P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 215-232 : P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

E. PORTAÎLE, *op. cit.*, col. 2277-2279; J. TIXBKONT, *op. cit.*, 393-396.

‡ Martin, *La doctrine sociale de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1912, p. 213-253.

V. THE FIGHT AGAINST PELAGIANISM.

Two phases may be distinguished in this long controversy : the first from 411 to the condemnation of Pelagianism by Rome in 418; the second from 419 to the death of Saint Augustine (430).

A). 1st Phase (411-418).

It was in Africa that the Pelagian system ²³was denounced and condemned for the first time, in the person of Coelestius, by the provincial Council of Carthage in 411. Saint Augustine, informed of this measure, at once realised its importance. He immediately set himself to refute the theories of these reformers, first in a series of sermons preached at Carthage, where he was invited by Aurelius, and then in various treatises he wrote against them. In 412, in answer to the tribune, Marcellinus, who had consulted him, he showed that the fall of Adam is the real cause of the death of man, and of the sin which is remitted by baptism, even in children ; this is the first book of the *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, often cited under the title of the second part of the book, *De baptismo parvulorum*, in which the author proves the existence of original sin, arguing notably from the traditional custom of child baptism. In book II is rejected the Pelagian "*impeccantia*" and in the IIIrd is rejected Pelagius' interpretation of the verse of the Epistle to the Romans (v, 12) which teaches the doctrine of original sin.

Marcellinus was puzzled at reading in the preceding work that man, aided by grace, *may be* without sin, but that, *in fact*, no man is without sin. Saint Augustine therefore set out to prove, on the one hand, the necessity of interior grace in order that man should keep God's laws, and, on the other hand, the necessary defection of the human will in some circumstances : this is the subject of the treatise *De spiritu et littera* ³, a title which is equivalent to "*De gratia et lege*" : *the law*, for Augustine, is a grace, but an exterior grace, it is the letter which kills; the spirit is that *interior grace* vouchsafed so that justice may be done and

¹ The writings against Pelagianism are found in *P. L.*, 44 and 45.

² See above, p. 391-394.

³ *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* : *P. Z.J* 44, >09-200. — ⁴ *De spiritu et littera* ¹, *P.L.*, 44, 201-246. Fren. tr. Dubois, 1700J

consummated, it is the grace of the Holy Ghost which vivifies by inspiring the joy of love '.

Meanwhile the reformers who had taken refuge in the East were insisting more than ever on the limitless moral power of man, on which was based their whole system. Coelestius, or one of his followers, had exposed, in a work entitled *Definitiones*, sixteen reasons to show that it is possible for man to be without sin³;* and Pelagius in his *De natura* ³ supposed that it was possible for man to be perfect by his own forces, since the faculty of not sinning is inseparable from nature. To the latter Saint Augustine first opposed his *De natura et gratia* ⁴, addressed to Timasius and James, two young men who had been converted to the religious life by Pelagius and who had sent to Augustine the treatise in which their master explained his theory¹ of man's chimerical "impeccantia". Shortly afterwards he used the same arguments against Coelestius in the treatise *On the perfect justice of infants*, written towards the end of 415.

The refutation of Pelagius had been carried out with great caution⁶, but Augustine pursued his campaign until the condemnation by Rome. He was uneasy about the heretic's propaganda in *Palestine*, and sent Paulus Orosius there to obtain first-hand information. His fears were justified, for Pelagius had gained the confidence of John of Jerusalem, who defended him when he was denounced by Orosius. When Pelagius was brought before the Council of *Diospolis* (415), he repudiated all the errors that had been previously condemned by the Council of Carthage in 411, and other doctrines drawn from Coelestius' writings, and was therefore allowed to remain in communion with the Church. Saint Jerome, who had his doubts about Pelagius' orthodoxy, thought that the bishops were hand in glove with him and

* See the Conclusion, c. xxxv-xxxvt, 61-66.

- This supposed power, which is sometimes termed "*impeccantia, impeccance*", should be distinguished from impeccability which means the impossibility of incurring. — ³ For Pelagius' writings, see above, p. 393, note 2.

¹ *De natura et gratia* ad Timasium et Jacobum; *I. l.*, 44. 247-290.

³ *Liber de perfectione justitiæ hominis (Epist. ad episcopos Eutropium et Paulum)*; *P. l.*, 44, 291-318.

⁶ Pelagius exercised a real influence even in the most aristocratic families, such for instance as the Anicii, of which the virgin Demetrias was a member. See *Epist.* 188, to Juliana, mother of Demetrius, and *Epist.* 186, to Saint Paulinus of Noia, kinsman to the Anicii, as was also Julian of Eclanum.

called the Council a "synodus miserabilis"¹; while later, Saint Augustine in his *De Gestis Pelagii* (417) ² stressed this recantation, made by Pelagius either through cowardice or duplicity, and also the condemnation of his errors by the Council. Pelagius' acquittal was badly received in Africa; a new Council of *Carthage*, held in 416, confirmed the Council of 411, and asked Pope Innocent I to associate himself with the previous condemnation³. A similar procedure was followed at the Council held at Milevis in 416, in which Augustine took part⁴. On the 27th January, 417, *Innocent I* condemned Pelagius and Coelestius⁵. On the 23rd September of the same year Augustine, announcing in the course of a sermon the reception of an answer from Rome, cried: "Inde etiam rescripta venerunt. *Causa finita est*. Utinain aliquando finiatur error"⁶ ⁷

During the period occupied by the hesitations of Pope Zozimus (417-418)⁷, Saint Augustine played an important and delicate part. It was he who wrote the letter to the Pope after the Council of 417, and who inspired, and perhaps drew up, the 9 canons of the Council of Carthage (May 1st, 418) in which is summarised the whole of Catholic teaching on the controverted points (existence of original sin, the necessity and the operation of grace, denial of the limitless power of the human will)⁸. When at last appeared the *Epistola tractatoria* of Zozimus (end of May, 418), in which the doctrine taught at Carthage received definite approval, Augustine could at last rejoice in the triumph of the truth he had always defended. He then set himself to show that Zozimus had never taught the Pelagian doctrines, but had been misled by false informations. He was also

¹ *Epist.* 143; *I. c.*, 22, 1181.

² *Liber de Gestis Pelagii ad Aurelium*; *P. L.*, 44, 319-360. In this work, written during the critical period of 417, Augustine gives a detailed account of the synod of Diospolis, in order to destroy the basis on which the Pelagians sought to build their teaching.

³ *Epist.* 175.

⁴ *Epist.* 176, 177. See also *Epist.* 178-179.

⁵ *Epist.* 181, 182, 183. See above, p. 393 and 518.

⁶ *Semi.* 131, to- See P. BATIFFOL, *Le catholicisme de S. Augustin*, p. 402-510. The popular expression of Augustine's phrase: *Roma locuta est; causi finita est*, does not belie the orator's original thought; "But", says Mgr Batiffol, "it is less rich in tenor than the authentic version".

⁷ See above, p. 393.

⁸ *p. L.*; 45, 1728-1730. Dbnzinger-Bann., *Enchiridion*, η. 101-108.

⁹ See I. Batiffol, *of. cit.*, p. 453.

charged by the Emperors to obtain the subscription of all the African bishops to the Pope's letter

Pelagius had a great reputation for virtue, and his condemnation astonished many good Christians. Melania and Pinianus having said as much to Augustine, the latter explained the duplicity of Pelagius, showing how he had given to the word *grace* the meaning of liberty, of law, of the remission of sins, and absolutely rejected all interior aid given to the will; this is the purpose of the *De gratia Christi*. In addition he exposed the reasons for admitting the existence of original sin in the treatise *De peccato originati*. These two books, which date from 418, are found together in one work'. Towards the end of 419 Saint Augustine developed his ideas on the transmission of original sin by treating the delicate question of the *origin of the soul*³: he entirely rejected Emanationism, but hesitated between Traducianism and Creationism. Even until the end of his life he remained undecided on this point⁴.

B). IInd Phase. 1. Controversy with Julian of Eclanum.

After their condemnation at Rome and in Africa, Pelagius and Coelestius disappeared from the scene, and left the defence of their teaching to Julian of Eclanum, one of the eighteen Italian bishops who had refused to submit. This man was a fine humanist, keenly interested in all matters of speculation, somewhat pedantic, who exalted the rights of reason to the detriment of the faith⁵. Hence, in dealing with such a man, Augustine had to insist chiefly on the authority of the Scriptures, the Fathers (taken together or even individually) and the Church: in brief, to establish the perpetuity of the faith in tradition. The controversy turned for the most part on the subject of concupiscence, and this in itself shows the masterly intellect of Julian; he attacked Augustine on the most vulnerable point of his teaching.

The Catholics had been accused, probably by Julian himself, of implicitly condemning marriage by their teaching on concupiscence, which, on the one hand, they termed sin; but which nevertheless, they realised, was inseparable from con-

¹ *Epist.* 201.

² *De gratia Christi et peccato originali*; *F. L.*, 44, 359-4°..

³ *De anima et ejus origine*; *P. L.*, 44, 475-548.

⁴ See for this question, E. PORTALIE, *op. cit.*, col. 2359-2361.

⁵ Saint Augustine says of him: "in disputatione loquacissimus!, in contentione calumniosissimus, in professione fallacissimus" (*Coni. Jul.*, *op. imp.*, tv, 50). It is a fact that Julian brought the most base accusations against Augustine, all of which are obviously false. For the controversy with Julian, see l^r. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 473-508.

jugal relations. This conclusion was rejected by Augustine in his letter (to Count Valerius) which became the first book of the *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (419). Julian immediately replied in a work of four books, accusing Augustine in particular of having invented the doctrine of original sin. Augustine at first replied to this impeachment in a summary and provisional writing which has since been added to the preceding work under the same title *. About the same time he sent to Pope Boniface, who had sent them to him in a friendly way, the refutation, in four books ² of two letters written against him, the first probably by Julian, the other by the eighteen Pelagian bishops, in which he was accused of Manichaeism, of denying free-will and condemning marriage. In 421 he undertook a detailed refutation of Julian's four books in his first *Contra Julianum* ³, consisting of six books. The first two books, which form a kind of general introduction, establish Catholic teaching on the authority of the Greek and Latin Fathers. The last four books follow closely Julian's work, on the subjects of original sin and marriage (bk. III), on concupiscence (bks. IV, V), on infant baptism (bk. VI); and constantly oppose revealed truth to Julian's Aristotelean rationalism.

Julian, however, would not admit defeat, and from Cilicia, where he had fled, he sent a violent pamphlet in eight books against the Bishop of Hippo, who received it only in 428. In spite of his seventy-four years, Augustine again took up the pen, and unmoved by his adversary's invective⁴, replied point by point to all the assertions of this fiery challenger. He was writing the sixth book when death came to interrupt his work. This is the voluminous and incomplete second treatise, *Contra Julianum* ⁵.

Saint Augustine was more fortunate in his dealings with the Gallic priest, Leporius, a Pelagian and Nestorian, who

* *De nuptiis et concupiscentia libri duo*; *P. L.*, 44, 413-474.

² *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*; *P. L.*, 44, 549-638.

³ *Contra Julianum hæresis Pelagianæ defensorem*; *P. L.*, 44, 641-874. French trans. Abbé de Vence, Paris, 1736.

⁴ Julian's evident liad faith, however, sometimes calls forth a lively and stinging thrust: *Stultitia et turpitudine vos peperit* (I, 12); *Erubescite, tu es iniquissimus* (ni, 55); *Mentiris* (ni, 134). Cf. π, 134; etc. He often scoffs at Julian's empty wordiness: *Spatiatu loquacitas inopia copiosa, ubi non cernitur, vel, si cernitur, spernitur veritas* (ni, 53).

⁵ *Contra Julianum, opus imperfectum, or Contra secundam Juliani responsionem*; *P. L.*, 45, 1049-1608.

having been expelled from Gaul had taken refuge with the bishop. The latter converted him and made him sign a retractation (*Libellus emendationis*) which was accepted by the Council of Carthage and enabled Leporius to return to his own country.

2. The Semipelagian Controversy ²³

Saint Augustine was led by the controversy on grace to take up a stand, towards the end of his life, against a milder form of the Pelagian error, which was later given the name of *Semipelagianism*. The controversy turned on matters which, until then, had been only incidentally treated; the absolute gratuity of grace, predestination and final perseverance.

The circumstance which gave rise to this question was a letter sent by Saint Augustine in 418 to the Roman priest, Sixtus ³ (who later became Sixtus III), in which he insisted on gratuitous predestination to grace, stating that the Pelagians, in order to deny this gratuity, alleged the future conditioned merits ⁴ of children. In this letter is found the famous expression : "Cum Deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat quam munera sua" ⁵.

The first show of opposition to the teaching contained in this letter took place in Africa. *The monks of Hadrumetum* (Tunis), having seen a copy of this letter in 426, thought that Augustine's doctrine of grace was destructive of free-will. In order to enlighten them he sent them the precious treatise *De gratia et libero arbitrio* ⁶, which proves the absolute gratuity of grace and at the same time safeguards the doctrine of free-will. The monks objected that man could not be *blamed* for his falls if his perseverance in good was due to grace alone. Augustine rejected this conclusion and proved to them that it is unacceptable, since free-will remains, and went on to establish more clearly the gratuity of predestin-

² *Libellus emendationis sive satisfactionis*; *P. L.*, 31, 1221-1230. See also *Epist.* 219 (In Augustine's correspondence). See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Degm.*, n, p. 380-381.

³ See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Degm.*, n, p. 482-511; in, p. 274-283.

⁴ *Epist.* 194; *P. L.*, 33, 874-891.

⁵ This scholastic expression indicates events depending on a future condition; events which would have taken place had the condition been fulfilled, or which will take place if the condition is fulfilled.

⁶ *Epist.* 194, n. 16. See below, art. iv, p. 683.

⁷ *De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentem et cum illo monachos*; *P. L.*, 44, 881-912.

ation and perseverance in another treatise, *De correptione et gratia* ' (427). It was also about the same time that he summarised in one work all his ideas concerning the gratuity of grace; this is the letter to *Vitalis* 3, a monk (?) of Carthage. The twelve rules contained in this letter are a clear and concise complement to the doctrine explained in the nine canons of Carthage, in 418. He forcefully maintained that without God, man can neither will nor perform meritorious acts.

In Gaul the opposition to Augustine was more lively and especially was it tenacious. Certain passages of the *De correptione et gratia* caused a great outcry at the monastery of Saint Victor at Marseilles, where for several years Cassian had been teaching a doctrine which on certain points resembled that of Pelagius 3. It may be reduced to the following

a) Although man, without the aid of grace, cannot perform supernatural good, he can desire and will it; he cannot obtain complete faith by his own forces, but he can *begin* to believe.

b) There exists neither absolute *predestination* nor absolute *reprobation*; both, considered in God, are to be identified with the *foreknowledge* of the merits and demerits of man, while, considered in man, they are the consequences of his conduct.

c) God, Who wills the salvation of all, offers salvation to all *indifferently*, and just as all may correspond to grace, so may all, if they desire, persevere in grace.

The mixture of truth and error in these propositions rendered them both dangerous and difficult to refute. Informed of this teaching by his friends in Gaul, Prosper of Aquitania and Hilarius 4, Augustine again undertook to defend the fulness of the rights of God in the work of the salvation of mankind; he composed the *De predestinatione sanctorum* 5 and the *De donoperseverantiæ*, which originally were but two parts of the same work. In the *first* treatise, Saint Augustine establishes the necessity of attributing to God even the beginning

' *De correptione et gratia ad eundem*; *P. L.*, 44, 915-946.

' *Epist.* 217, to Vitalis; *P. L.*, 33, 978-989.

3 See above, p. 601-603.

4 *Epist.* 225 (Prosper), 226 (Hilarius); *P. L.*, 33, 1002-1007 and 1007-1012; or *J. L.*, 44, 947-954 and 953-960.

5 *De predestinatione sanctorum, Liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium primus!* *P. L.*, 44, 953-992. Fr. trans: Arnaud, 1676.

of salvation, even the desire of good (and here he recalls the error of his youth) ¹; he then goes on to prove that predestination or the preparation to grace is independent of all foreknowledge of future merits. In the *second*² he shows that final perseverance is also a special gift of God, and then rejects the false conclusions that are drawn from the doctrine of predestination. He even states that this doctrine can be taught with profit³; it may be briefly defined: the foreknowledge and preparation of the divine benefits, by which those who are saved are infallibly saved⁴. Unfortunately, Augustines' works did not restore peace in Gaul, where views differing fairly widely from his, were held.

VI. LAST YEARS. DEATH OF SAINT AUGUSTINE.

In 426 Augustine confided the external administration of his diocese to an auxiliary, Heraclius, whom he named to the clergy and laity as his successor in the See. Nevertheless, he was unable to find the repose he so ardently desired to prepare himself for eternity. In addition to the combat he was carrying on with Julian of Eclanum and the Semipelagians, he had to make a stand against fresh perils. With the Barbarians, *Arianism* again⁵ began to show its head. The *Goths* of the Imperial army, sent against the rebellious Count Boniface, were accompanied at Hippo by Maximinus^{6,7} an Arian bishop, with whom he entered into controversy in a public debate and in various writings⁷. The *Vandals*

¹ Chiefly c. m., 7. See below, p. 683.

² De dono perseverantiæ, *Liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium secundus*; P. L., 45, 993-1034. Fr. trans: Arnaud, 1676.

³ *Ibid.*, c. XXII, 57 sq. See p. 695.

⁴ See below, p. 688-695.

⁵ Already in 418 Augustine had to refute an anonymous Arian sermon which was being circulated in his diocese. This was the subject of the *Liber contra sermonem Arianorum*; P. L., 43, 677-708.

⁶ Maximinus, having assented to a public debate, took up almost the whole of the first session by a long discourse, and immediately afterwards left for Carthage, fearing no doubt his adversary's answer, to whom he had conceded that there are three Persons in God, but held that they were diverse in operation and substance. Saint Augustine shows up his unfair behaviour in the *Collatio cum Maximino. Arianorum episcopo*, P. L., 42, 709-742, and refuted him in the *Contra Maximinum hæreticum*, P. L., 42, 743-814.

⁷ As an appendix to the study on Augustine's controversial works may be mentioned the *Liber de hæresibus* (P. L., 42, 21-50), which dates from this period, 428-429, and consists of a synopsis of the heresies. Augustine counts 88 from Simon Magus to Pelagius. The book is addressed to the deacon, (luod-vultdeus.

whom Boniface called to his aid were also Arians, of unspeakable ferocity, laying waste all before them. Boniface came to terms with the Imperial Court and Augustine persuaded him to turn against the Vandals; but Boniface was defeated and besieged in Hippo. The town held out for three months before it yielded to the enemy.

Saint Augustine died during the third month of the siege, on August 28th, 430. When he felt his end approaching he asked to be left alone. Thus he passed the last ten days of his life in profound contemplation and unceasing prayer. The collapse of the Empire, and consequently of the existing order of society, must have indeed quickened his desire for that unchanging Life (*vita incommutabilis*) which had long been the undivided aspiration of his soul. His body was taken to Sardinia in the time of Saint Fulgentius, and in the eighth century the King of the Lombards, Luitprandius, had it removed to Pavia, where his tomb is still venerated in the Church of Saint Peter 23

ARTICLE II. NON-CONTROVERSIAL WORKS.

I. THE CONFESSIONS 3.

The *Confessions*, written about the year 400, is not merely a book of *avowals*, but is above all a book of praise made to God in acknowledgment of His blessings and a homage rendered to His perfection; such is the sense of the Latin word, *confiteni*. Saint Augustine repeats this incessantly in the course of his book, and in the *Retractions* he says: "The thirteen books of my *Confessions* praise the just and good God for all the blessings and all the misfortunes that have befallen me; they raise up to Him the mind and the heart of man. I myself have found this profit in composing them and I still find it when I read them again. What advantage will others find in them? They will see for themselves. But

* *Epist.* 220.

3 See Gbrmer-Durand, *Le tombeau de S. Augustin à Ravie*, in *Revue flû Part chrétien*, 1878, p. 257-274.

3 *L.*, 32, 659-868. *Studies*: C. Douais, *Les Confessions de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1893. H. Gros, *La valeur documentaire des "Confessions" de S. Aug.*, in *Eie spirit.*, 1926, 1927 (5 articles). English trans, in the above mentioned editions.

4 For instance, in Ps. 117 t *Confitemini Domino quoniam bonus*. See *Serm.* 29: *P. L.* 38, 186-187.

I know that the work has pleased a great number of the brothers, and pleases them still " Posterity has confirmed this judgment. "Of all the works of the sainted Doctor", says Portalíé, " no other has been so widely read and admired " 2.

To reach, therefore, a full understanding of this work we must consider it from the author's point of view. It is not so much a history as a prayer, a contemplation, *an elevation to God*, written by a bishop and a saint, wholly united to God by the most ardent and enlightened love. The details it furnishes regarding Saint Augustine's ever deepening union with God are no less instructive than the information it contains concerning the stages of his return to the faith. It is perhaps this quality of the *Confessions* which has the most affected the Christian life of later centuries.

Division.—First of all Saint Augustine praises God for the graces he has received *in his past life*, and opposes to them his own sins (bks. 1-ix) ; he then praises Him with regard to his *present state* in the last four books (x-xiii) which form a logical second part, of which the plan seems to be indicated in the following passage : " Non dubia, sed certa conscientia, Domine, amo te. Percussisti cor meum verbo tuo et amavi te; sed et *calum et terra* et omnia quæ in eis sunt, ecce undique mihi dicunt ut te amem, nec cessant dicere omnibus ut sint inexcusabiles " 3.

First Part (bks. 1-ix). Saint Augustine first sings the mercies God has shown forth in him from his first childhood until the age of fifteen years (bk. I), during his youth and while he was still a student (bks. II-III), during his life as a professor until his arrival at Milan (bks. iv-v). He praises Him again on the occasion of his gradual return to the faith, first in the *conversion of his mind*, which still left him, however, many moral weaknesses (bk. vi) and intellectual difficulties, which were removed in part by Neo-Platonism (bk. vii) ; in his final and *total conversion* (bk. viii ; ch. 1-5) : visit to Simplicianus ; (ch. 6-7) : visit from Pontitianus ; (ch. 8-12) : final crisis, the incident of the garden ; lastly, in *his new life* (bk. IX ; ch. 1-5) : the retreat at Cassiciacum ; ch. 6-7 : baptism ; ch. 8-13 ; death of Saint Monica at Ostia 4.

Second Part (bks. x-xiii). After this recital, the author takes us brusquely to the year 400, twelve years later. Augustine now praises God with regard to the spiritual state of soul in which he now finds himself. In the long and admirable book X (in 43 chaps.), he first declares (ch. 6) that he loves God and that he has not *found* Him in exterior things (ch. 6-7) but in his own self ; he describes at length the three degrees of the ascension by which he has risen to the contemplation of God (chs. 8-26), and in chs. 26-29 hymns his joy at having

¹ *Retract.*, bk. II, c. vi, I. — 3 *Op. cit.*, col. 2286-2287.

² *Confess.*, bk. X, c. VI, 8.

⁴ For all these details see the beginning of the preceding article, p. 614-620.

⁵ See art. tv, p. 673.

found Him, far too late, and in himself : *Sero te amavi, pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova! sero te amavi! Et ecce intus eras et ego foris, et ibi te quarebam. Mecum eras et tecum non eram* (ch. 27). The book goes on with a humble account of the author's present weaknesses, the temptations which besiege him and the way he fights them (chs. 30-42), and ends with giving homage to Christ, our only Mediator (ch. 43). Augustine, having thus *found* his God, loves to re-discover Him in all His creatures and in Holy Writ, and to these exercises he devotes the last three books of the *Confessions* (bks. XI-XIII), admiring the action of God in the work of creation; pages which, says Portalié, are "A sublime contemplation of the Creation, telling the glory of God". All this second part, says the same author, "is not a digression, as has sometimes been thought, but the natural complement of the whole work : Augustine gives us an intimate portrait of his soul, as it was when transfigured by grace and by faith" ¹.

This simple abstract is a sufficient indication of the character of the *Confessions*. It possesses nothing in common with the biographies inspired by the egoism and pride of certain modern authors, striving before all to be in the limelight. *Humility* and *sincerity*, the first necessary conditions of work of this kind, pervade every page of Saint Augustine's work. Moreover, even from other points of view, Portalié awards Saint Augustine an indisputable superiority. "Neither for the *penetrating analysis* of the most complex impressions of the soul, nor for the *sympathy* it evokes, nor for its *nobility* of sentiment and its *depth* of philosophical outlook has this book ever had its equal in any literature" ²³. The lyrical quality of many pages of this masterpiece has also been rightly stressed; and it is this, together with the wealth and originality of his views which redeem the many digressions, which, as in Augustine's other great works, are also found in the *Confessions*.

II. PHILOSOPHICAL DIALOGUES'.

The *Confessions* depict for us the state of Augustine's soul at the term of his long ascension to God. The *philosophical writings*, show us him as he was during one of the stages of this ascension, more than ten years previously. For Augustine, the study of philosophy meant a way of approach to God and not merely an intellectual exercise; wisdom is one of God's beatifying properties; such is the Neo-Platonic conception which Augustine adopted and

¹ E. Portalié, *op. cit.* col. 2286. — ²³ E. Portalié, *op. cit.* 2287.

³ All in *P. !...* 32.

Christianised. But at the time he wrote he had not fully achieved Christian perfection ; hence many notable differences between the *Dialogues* and the *Confessions*. These have been exaggerated by modern critics¹ but they cannot be denied. In addition to the divergency of subjects treated, there exists a difference of *tone*. The *Confessions* give an impression of peace and repose in God, a relative repose of course, which does not exclude interior and even intellectual activity, but which really does exclude all *uneasiness* in the quest of God. The *Dialogues*, on the contrary, are dominated by a fiery aspiration, an almost feverish restlessness, and especially an extraordinary mental effort. At this period Augustine thought it possible to possess God *perfectly* in this world ; hence his insistency in identifying wisdom with happiness. This error was corrected in the *Retractions*. He also exaggerated the efficacy of philosophy in the achievement of union with God. Later, he insisted on the preponderating and perhaps exclusive part played by *piety*, and often identified *wisdom* with *piety*.

Eight of Augustine's philosophical dialogues are extant : four were written at Cassiciacum ; the other four date from a later period.

The first three are the result of the discussions provoked by Augustine at Cassiciacum for the purpose of continuing the education of his youthful pupils, Licentius and Trygetius. Alypius also took part when he was there. The subjects of these discussions were no less religious than philosophical. *d*) In the "Contra Academicos"², *certitude*, the basis of all religion, is discussed (from Nov. 386) : the sceptical tendencies of the New Academy from which Augustine had suffered for some years, and of which certain objections still caused him uneasiness, are rejected absolutely in this work : happiness is to be found, not in *intellectual probing*, but in knowledge of truth (bk. 1) ; mere *probability* does not suffice ; man can and must attain *certitude* (bks. 11-in). *A*) The *De beata vita*³ treats of the nature of *true happiness* (from 13-15 Nov. 386) : Augustine concludes that this is only to be found in the knowledge of God, and later he qualified this statement by affirming that only in the future life will it be possessed to the full, *c*) The *De ordine*⁴ deals with *Providence* (386) ; the order established by Providence does not exclude *evil* in the world (bk. 1) : it guides the wise man in all his mental operations, the *education* of which supposes the aid of reason, of authority and of the fine arts, and which terminates in the perfect knowledge of God (bk. n).

¹ See above, p. 619.

² P. 32, 905-958.

³ 32, 959-976.

⁴ Z., 32, 977-2020. Fr. trans. Dubois, 170t.

The Soliloquies¹ (387) are also in the form of a dialogue, in two books, between Augustine (A) and his reason (R). In the *first book*, after a long and magnificent prayer, Augustine sets out to know God and to seek the virtues required for this knowledge. In *book II*, finding that truth is immortal, he concludes to the immortality of the soul, which is the seat of truth. The work reveals Augustine's ardent straining towards God, as well as his efforts to attain Him by knowledge. The *Confessions* show more heartfelt emotion and peace of soul. Several points of the *Soliloquies* are found corrected in the *Retractions*, particularly the affirmation that in this world the knowledge of God can bring a degree of happiness founded on more than hope².

This authentic dialogue should not be confused with the *Liber Soliloquiorum anima ad Deum*, a compilation made in the thirteenth century from extracts from the true Soliloquies, the Confessions, the works of Hugh of St. Victor and the Council of Lateran (1198). The *Meditations* and the *Manual of Saint Augustine* date from the same period and contain much from Saint Anselm's works³*

The *later philosophical dialogues* treat : *a*) of *immortality* (*De immortalitate animas* Milan, 387; a supplement to the Soliloquies in 16 chaps.); *b*) of the various *operations* of the soul : Saint Augustine enumerates seven, which form its true greatness (*De quantitate animae*, Rome, 388); *c*) of *knowledge* (*De magistro*⁶; Africa, 389) : God is the true inward master of every man, for He is the principle of all knowledge as He is the cause of all being; *d*) lastly, of *music*, for the purpose of "raising the spirit of the changing rhythm of souls and bodies to the unchanging rhythm of eternal truth" (*De musica*, from 387-391, in 6 books). This last work is the only one to remain of the *Encyclopedia of Fine Arts*, undertaken at this time by Augustine⁸

The influence of Platonism on Augustine's mind is undeniable; it was deep and lasting, and was on the whole productive of good results. The most outstanding points which he assimilated from this teaching were the following : *a*') the nature of *philosophy* ; true wisdom must lead to the possession of God and happiness; *b*') the distinction between the rational knowledge of temporal things and the *intellection*, of

¹ *P. L.*; 32, 869-904. Fr. trans. Pellissier, Paris, 1853.

² *Retract.*, bk. I, c. IV, 3. *P. L.*, 32, 590.

³ These three writings are found in *P.* 40, 863-898 (Soliloquies), 901-941 (Meditations), 951-968 (Manual).

⁴ *P. L.*, 32, 1021-1034. — s *P. Z.*, 32, 1033-1080.

⁵ *Æ Lt* 3A V93 '270. — *P. L.*, 32, 1081-1194.

To these philosophical works may be compared many of Augustine's writing! against the Manichaeans : *De libero arbitrio*, *De natura boni*.

⁹ See the *De beata vita*.

knowledge of eternal things : this latter alone is the characteristic of wisdom, and attains God ; c) the method of *degrees* by which the mind is gradually purified in order to facilitate this superior operation of the intelligence; d') the *idea of God*, conceived as being Truth, and the universal principle of being, truth and good ; 2 o') the doctrine of *exemplarism* is included in these principles; all beings are realisations of the ideas of God, and all knowledge a participation in His thought, which is the perfect exemplary of all things; /) the conception of the *radical goodness of* the created world, by which Augustine refuted Manichaeism.

The theory of knowledge is guided by these great principles. Saint Augustine attaches great importance to first principles, the object proper to the intelligence, in which, without the aid of ontologism ³, he is fond of showing that God is to be found. He attributes their formation in the mind ⁴ to an action of God, which is no other than that general activity by which God, the exemplary cause, is also the cause of all intellectual enlightenment, since He produces all created effects ⁵. This point of view attracted Augustine on account of the advantages it procures and especially because it provides a natural basis for wisdom, which enables us to find God, and which is a notable effect of the Divine action in souls.

III. SAINT AUGUSTINE'S THEOLOGICAL AND APOLOGETICAL WORKS.

This part of the Augustinian work is immense. For the sake of clarity they will be classed as follows : the writings on the foundations of religion and the Miscellanies, the great treatises on the Trinity, and the City of God; lastly, the

¹ See below, p. 663, and p. 673.

See below, art. III, p. 667, and art. IV, p. 674.

² See E. Portalíé, *op. cit.*, col. 2334-2335.

⁴ Saint Augustine does not admit the theory of innate ideas (*De Trinit.*, bk. XII, c. XV, 24).

According to Portalíé, Augustine affirmed that God took the place of the ii. live intellect in the human mind as regards first principles. *Ibid.*, col 2337. Ch. Boyer, *L'idée de vérité*, p. 210, differs from his interpretation. It were better to think, with the majority of the scholastics, that Saint Augustine admits that our ideas derive from the senses; but he elaborated no theory on abstraction in the true meaning of the word; on the contrary, he insisted, with a mystical purpose, on the spontaneous character of first intuitions, which are the foundation of all our knowledge.

Enchiridion, a theological synopsis, with which will be classed the moral works.

A). Writings on the foundations of religion

I. The most outstanding among these works is the *De vera religione* ², a little apologetical masterpiece in 55 chapters, composed at Tagaste (389-391) and addressed to Romanianus. After having shown the truth of the Christian religion against the Pagan and Manichæan philosophers (ch. X-XXIII), Augustine points out (ch. XXIV sq.) the two ways in which Divine Providence provides for the salvation of men ; i. e., by authority and reason ; from chapter XXXIX he treats the latter in more detail, raising man to God through the consideration of the lower beings (ch. xxix-xxxviii) and even through the examination of his vicious instincts (ch. xxxix sq.). The end to which he desires to lead his readers consists in Christian perfection (ch. XLVIII sq.) possessed in perfect liberty through the contemplation of truth and knowledge of the Scriptures.

2. The four following writings also deal with faith, which is discussed from various points of view.

a) The *De utilitate credendi* ³ (391) proves to the Manichæan, Honoratus, that faith is not blind, but founded on authority, the authority of God speaking to His Church.

b) The *De fide rerum quæ non videntur* ⁴ (about 400) deals with the same subject.

c) The *De fide et symbolo* ⁵ (393) is a brief explanation of the Creed.

d) The *De fide et operibus* ⁶ (413) shows that faith without works (penance, the practice of virtues....) does not suffice for salvation.

3. Three of Augustine's *doctrinal Miscellanies* are extant.

«) The *De diversis quæstionibus* LXXXIII ⁷ is a collection made by Augustine in 396 of solutions he gave to questions put to him by the monks of Tagaste or of Hippo during

¹ The works here mentioned are more than apologetica! ; they have a real theological character. This remark applies more particularly to the *De civitate Dei*. As works which are purely apologetica! in nature we would cite two little opuscula: *De divinatione demonum*, P. L., 40, 581-592, and *Adversus Judaos*, P. L., 42, 51-64.

² P. L., 34, 121-172. Fr. trans. Dubois, 1690. Together with the *De utilitate credendi*, this work may be classed among the anti-Manichæan works.

³ P. L., 42, 65-92. Fr. tr. Dubois, 1741. See Mgr Batiifoi's profound study of this treatise in the *Revue Biblique*, 1917, p. 7-53, or in the *Catholicism* ⁸ de S. Augustin, ch. I.

⁴ P. L., 40, 171-180. — ⁵ P. L., 40, 181-196.

⁶ P. L., 40, 197-230. — ⁷ P. L., 40, ti-100.

conversations or conferences before he was made bishop. They treat of philosophical, dogmatic or exegetical subjects.

A) The *De diversis quæstionibus ad Simplicianum* (397) contains replies to various questions put by the Bishop of Milan on the *Epistle to the Romans* (bk. I) and on the *Books of Kings* (bk. II). *Book one* is especially important since it contains the clear expression of Augustine's ideas on grace (with reference to *Rom.* VII, 7-23) and on predestination (*Rom.* XI, 10-29). Very little of this work had to be revised in the *Retractions*. It should be noted that in this work Augustine already attributes to God the whole work of salvation, even its *beginning*.

o') *De octo Dulcitii quæstionibus* 2 (422) consists chiefly in a collection of quotations from previous works, and was destined to answer the difficulties raised by the Tribune, Dulcitius.

B) Treatise on the Trinity 3.

This is Augustine's most profound and most lengthy dogmatic work. He worked at it from 400 to 416. The first twelve books having been made known to the public without his knowledge and before he had had occasion to revise them, he was discouraged and resolved not to continue the work. But he gave in to the supplications of his brother monks and added the last three books (xm-xv).

The work contains *two parts*. *The first* (bks. I-VII) establishes the doctrine of the Trinity according to the Scriptures and the Fathers, and answers the objections. *The second* (bks. VIII-XV) seeks analogies in man in order to provide a certain understanding of the mystery 4.

Ist Part. The first four books explain, according to the Scriptures, the unity and the equality of the Divine Persons. The Vth refutes the philosophical objections by means of the doctrine of *relations* : " Demonstratur non omne quod de Deo dicitur *secundum substantiam* dici, sed dici etiam *relative*,

• *J. L.*, 40, 101-148. — • *P. L.*, 40, 147-170.

• *J. L.*, 42, 819-1098. See Th. de Régnon, *Etudes sur la sainte Trinité*, i 1 and 11; the author chiefly develops the Augustinian conception according to the scholastics. We have analysed the second part of the *De Trinitate* (in *Canonisation Augustinienne*, c. 1V, pag. 95-134), stressing the spiritual element in his reaching.

• See a summary of the first 14 books in book XV, c. nt, 5; *P. L.*, 42, 1059-1061.

ici est, non *ad se*, sed *ad aliquid* quod ipse non est" *. In book VI the *equality* of the Persons is re-affirmed, in spite of the attribution of particular titles to one or the other, notably the titles of Wisdom and Virtue given to the Son. In book VII the *unity* of the Persons is again insisted upon. There is in God, he says, "una virtus et una sapientia, sicut unus Deus et una essentia" a. He also gives precision to the manner of speaking of the Trinity and the reasons for the usual formulas: "*una essentia, tres personæ*; or *una essentia, tres hypostases (substantiæ)*."

The IInd Part, as a whole, is not so theological in the strict sense of the word; it possesses greater originality and is very rich in the new avenues of speculation it opens up, and even in its long digressions, notably on the knowledge of God and union with Him by faith, charity and wisdom. Saint Augustine here seeks to *show* us the Trinity, as it were, by means of various images and analogies which do in some way represent it. But none of these is developed with the rigour and method of the Scholastics. It would seem that the author is less concerned with satisfying the mind with a rigorous demonstration than with gradually leading souls to God in Three Persons by means of a series of ever simpler images of divine activity *ad intra*. Just as he leads man by stages to the contemplation of the Godhead 3, so he draws him by degrees to the contemplation of the Trinity.

Book VIII, which forms a kind of transition between the first and the second part, helps the acquisition of a purely spiritual *knowledge* of God, by means of man's knowledge of truth, good and justice; it shows that the Trinity is often loved without explicit knowledge, and that the knowledge of the Trinity is not so much the result of exterior research as of piety and charity. In the latter, however, may be remarked certain traces of the Trinity.

Books IX and X develop the most easily comprehended image of the Trinity, that of man *secundum mentem*. Saint Augustine treats it in two ways: «) in book IX he distinguishes in the soul "*mens, et notitia* quæ se novit, et amor quo se notitiamque suam diligit; et hæc tria æqualia inter se, et unius ostenduntur esse essenti" *, b) in book X the same image is rendered more precise: Augustine finds a more evident Trinity (*evidentior trinitas*) in the *memory* (the mind furnished with known truths), the *intelligence* (the thinking mind), the *will* (the spiritual mind, or soul which loves).

* *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. IV, 5.

a *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. IV, 5.

3 See art. IV, p. 673.

* See bk. XV, l. e.

Book XI contains a *grosser* image of the Trinity, and hence more difficult to grasp, which probably explains why Augustine gives it after the preceding one : this is *corporeal vision*, and its superior degree, *imaginative vision*. In the first he distinguishes the object perceived, its form as received by the eye, and the union of the two, by means of the act of the one who sees. In the second, similarly, he finds a corporeal form preserved in the memory (imaginative), a perception of this form by actual recollection, and the association of the two by the operation of the one who perceives them interiorly.

Books XII, XIII, XIV seek a more profound and more perfect image of the Trinity than all those that have gone before : Augustine finds such an image in *wisdom*. First of all he clearly distinguishes (bk. XII) *this wisdom* (which resides in that nobler part of the mind of which the proper object is the contemplation of eternal realities) ', from *knowledge* (rational comprehension of temporal realities) ; a certain trinity may be discerned in the latter, but it is not the *image* of God. The same must be said of the *knowledge which comes through faith* treated in book XIII, which is entirely devoted to the examination of this virtue : faith, which is the guide of our moral life, has for its only author Jesus Christ, and in this connection Saint Augustine treats at length of the Redemption', completing what has already been said above with regard to the Incarnate Word³. This knowledge itself constitutes a certain trinity (memory, recollection, love), says Augustine, but it is imperfect and transitory.

On quite a different plane is *wisdom*, which is treated *ex professo* in book XIV. It is identical with piety (θεοσέβεια, ευσέβεια) (ch. I). It is through wisdom that man becomes a perfect image of God, and of the Trinity ; an image which will persist in the next life, where it will come to perfection in the Beatific Vision. This image is formed by the interior and moral renewal of the whole man. This renewal supposes : 1) *the knowledge of God* memory and conscience (ch. XV); 2) intellectual constancy in being guided by the latter, in order to attain "justice, holiness and truth" (ch. XVI); 3) the cleaving of the heart to God, by which its love is transformed into pure *charity* (ch. XVII). It is thus that the human trinity, constituted by the memory, the understanding and the will, becomes a perfect *image of God* (ch. XII) and shares in the divinity : "Accedente quidem ista ad participationem *natura*, *veritatis*, et *beatitudinis* illius" (ch. XII-IV). Thus also the soul acquires wisdom : "Quod cum facit, sapiens ipsa fit" (ch. XII); "et sic percipit sapientiam ubi est *contemplatio* æternorum" (bk. XV, ch. III).

Book XV resumes the theological development of the doctrine of the Trinity, which had been interrupted by these long *excursus*, destined to prepare the reader⁴ to see God in

¹ *De Trinit.*, bk. XII, c. III, 3 and c. XIV, 22.

De Trinit., bk. XIII, c. x-xix. — ³ *De Trinit.*, bk. IV.

⁴ "Volentes in rebus quæ factæ sunt, ad cognoscendum eum a quo factæ sunt. *exercere lectorem*, jam pervenimus ad ejus imaginem quod est homo... Supra hanc ergo naturam si quærimus aliquid, et verum quærimus. Deus est, natura scilicet non creata, sed creatrix. Quæ utrum sit Trinitas, non solum credentibus, divinæ scripturæ auctoritate; verum etiam *intelligentibus, aliqua*, si possumus, *ratione iam demonstrare debemus*". *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. I.

himself, by drawing his attention to those of God's works in which He is the more perfectly represented, that is to say, man, and in man that wisdom which contemplates eternal realities. It is in the latter (ch. IV) that Augustine lastly desires to show God, One and Three. After having explained, not without subtilty, that the innumerable divine attributes may be reduced to three principal ones: *ceternus*, *sapiens*, *beatus*, and then to one alone which expresses all, *sapiens*, and having shown the Trinity by means of these images, since, in this world, vision is only possible *per speculum* (ch. vili), he treats separately of the origin of the Persons: first, he deals with the Word (ch. x-xvi), then chiefly of the Holy Ghost (ch. xvii-xxvii) and terminates with a splendid prayer to the Holy Trinity (ch. XXVIII). Such is the powerful work on which Saint Augustine spent fifteen years

C) The City of God.

*The City of God*² was composed (at the request of the tribune, Marcellinus, to whom the first books were addressed) from 413 to 426, in order to refute the Pagan accusation which, after the Barbarian invasions, charged the Christians with being responsible for the evil which had befallen the Empire. The question at issue was therefore the problem of Providence in relation to the Roman Empire. But this frame of reference was too narrow for Augustine. He undertook to study the *providential action of God with regard to the whole of mankind*, and this not only in *past* time but also in the *future* and even in the next world. "In a flash of genius which transformed the apology into a philosophy of history", says Portalié, "he saw in one glance the *destinies of the world grouped around the Christian religion*, the one and only religion, which properly understood, is seen to go back to the beginnings and which leads mankind to its final end".

Saint Augustine broadens the meaning of the word *city* and makes it synonymous with *society*. He perceives but two cities in the world, that of the *just*, the city of God or celestial city, and that of the *wicked*, city of the devil or

¹ The charming legend of the child endeavouring to drain the sea with a shell has not found favour with the critics (see STILTING, *Acta Sanctorum*, t. v/J Augusti, n. 125), but it retains all its symbolic value.

² P. L., 41, 13-804. Various translations, see above. See abstracts in Tillemont, p. 608-612 and Dom Ceillier, p. 288-327; and studies M. G. Boissier, *La fin du paganisme*, H. p. 339-390. E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.* col. 2290-2291.

terrestrial city. It is through their love that men adhere to one or the other of these two groups'. It would be an unjustifiable restriction of Augustine's attitude to see in the two cities only the two cities of the Church and the State³, although he clearly explains the principles which should guide their relations, principles which were properly appreciated by such men as Gregory VII and Charlemagne. The two cities, which are confused always and everywhere in this world, are in constant strife. God does not remain indifferent to the struggle, and by means of His Providence prepares the victory of the celestial city, a triumph which will be consummated in the fulness of time. Such is the marvellous plan of the most sublime epic ever conceived by the genius of man.

Division. Saint Augustine, however, does not go to the heart of his subject until, in the *1st Part* (books I-ix), he has rejected the *Pagan accusations* against the Church by attacking Paganism itself. In the 12 books (xi-xxii) of the *IInd Part* he constructs his system, and explains his doctrine of God's action in the world. He shows that in Christianity, in spite of the opposition of its enemies, *God leads a part of mankind*, that part which by its love forms the city of God, towards its eternal destiny and final triumph in heaven.

The *1st Part* is a vigorous offensive against Paganism. Here Augustine establishes its absolute ineptitude:

t) *to assure prosperity in this world* (books I-5): after a book devoted to the fall of Rome (bk. I) he shows the powerlessness of the gods (bks. II-III), indicates the true causes of Roman greatness (bk. IV, imitated by Bossuet), and rejects Fate in the name of Providence (bk. V);

2) *to prepare happiness in the next world* (bks. VI-x): here Augustine makes a sharp and biting criticism of Pagan theology, first of the old popular mythology as represented by Varro's "Roman Antiquities" (bks. VI-VII) and then of the theology of the philosophers (bk. VIII) and especially of Neo-Platonic demonology (bks. IX-x).

The *IInd Part* (bks. XI-XII) explains the doctrine of the two cities: a) their origin (*exortus*), bks. XI-XIV; b) their progress (*procurus*), bks. XV-XVII; c) their end (*finis debiti*), bks. XVIII-XXII.

a) Saint Augustine seeks the origin of the two cities in the creation of the angels and their separation into good and evil spirits (bks. XI-XII) then in the creation of man (XIII) and his fall, which was the cause of sin in the whole of mankind, and from which a part is saved by God (XIII-XIV). This study of the beginnings comes to an end with the famous conclusion on the two loves in which the two cities originate, and the enumeration of the various aspects in which they are opposed to each other (bk. XIV, ch. 28).

³ "Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo : terrenam scilicet, amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, cælestem vero, amor Dei, usque ad contemptum sui". *Isr Civ. Dei*, bk. XIV, c. XXVIII.

This is sometimes his meaning, but it is only secundar). See art. IV, p. 705.

ι) The development of the two cities, presented on a historical background, comprises four periods. Book xv shows them striving from the beginning of the world until the flood, and book xvi under the patriarchs until the time of David. Book xvii treats of the City of God alone, under the prophets after David until Christ. The greater part of book xviii deals first with the terrestrial city during the same period (history of the empires), but from ch. 27 it treats of the Messianic prophecies, while the last chapters (46-54) of the same book study the development of the two cities from the time of Christ until the end of the persecutions.

η) The end of the two cities is shown in the four last books. Book XIX contrasts the Christian teaching on beatitude in the next world with the false theories of the philosophers. Book XX treats of the end of the world and the last judgment, when the two cities will be separated. The subject of book xxi is the punishment of the terrestrial city in hell, and book xxii deals with the final triumph of the city of God in heaven and the beatitude of the elect.

Appreciation of the City of God. As may be seen, the subject to be treated was immense: Augustine enlarged it even more by long dogmatic, moral and historical digressions, which detract somewhat from the unity of the theme in spite of their interest; but "his contemporaries, who wrested each book from the author as soon as it was written", says Portalié, "were troubled less by a view of the work as a whole than interested in the current questions they found treated from so noble a standpoint". The subject chosen embraced "every problem which troubled the human mind, and the author was lavish in profound and original views". Thus the *City of God* is more than an *apology* (the greatest apology of early times), more than a *history*; it is also true *theology*: it is, remarks Portalié, "living theology in the historical framework of humanity", theology which explains "the action of God in the world", just as the *Confessions* consists of theology as experienced in a soul, and the history of God's action in individuals¹. It is in this work, as also in the *Enchiridion*, that Augustine has also best explained his eschatological teaching.

D) The *Enchiridion*² and moral works.

I. The *Enchiridion*, an opusculum in 122 chapters, written in 421, has always been "considered as a manual of veritable

¹ E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2291.

² *Enchiridion ad Laurentium, seu De fide, spe et caritate*; P. L., 40, 231-291. Fr. trans.: Arnaud, 1685. Study: J. B. Faure, *Annotationes in Enchiridion!* Rome, 1755.

Augustinism". Nowhere else perhaps has Augustine better summarised his teaching, nor better emphasised his method. Laurentius, a pious and cultivated Roman, had asked him for a dogmatic summary, easy to consult. Augustine replied by exhorting him to seek wisdom, that is to say, *piety*, the *worship of God*, in faith, hope and charity (ch. 1-3). He must go to the Creed for the things he must believe, but the *Lord's Prayer* will show him for what he must hope and what he must love. Augustine added the explanation of the *Pater* to that of the *Creed*, since faith without virtue is useless (7-8). Chapters 9-113, which form the body of the treatise, contain an explanation of the faith; these chapters are finely written and carefully polished, as witness the many classical quotations. Augustine treats at length of certain fundamental errors, such as Manichaeism and Pelagianism, and develops certain doctrinal points regarding both dogma and morality (the idea of sin and error, of baptism and penance...). The last chapters, 114-121, deal briefly with hope and with charity, which is the end of all the precepts. Conclusion, c. 122.

Two other summaries should be classed with the *Enchiridion* :

⟨z⟩ book I (397) of the treatise *De doctrina Christiana*, which will be studied later;

b) the *De agone Christiano* ' (396-397), a manual of Christian life, written for the people; the author here expresses himself in very simple terms, and unlike his practice in the *Enchiridion*, deals more with moral than with dogmatic subjects.

2. *Moral Works*. In the *Enchiridion* the moral teaching is closely linked with dogma, and the same may be said of all Augustine's works: "No one better than Augustine", says Portalé, "was able to show the unbreakable bond which causes moral teaching to depend on dogma. All is dogmatic in his great work, and it is hardly possible to name a work purely moral in its theme. But to all his dogmatic works he has given a practical application for the life of the soul" ‡.

There are some fifteen works devoted to moral questions.

a) Two deal with "Lying" :

1) The *De mendacio* § (395), which even the author found obscure, is nevertheless "well calculated to exercise the mind and inspire a love of truth in conduct" *.

' P. L., 40, 289-310.

2 E. Portalé, *op. cit.*, col. 2432.

3 P. L., 40, 487-518.

4 *Retract.*, bk. I, c. XVII.

2) The *Contra Mendacium* ¹ (420), dedicated to Consensus, and destined to replace the foregoing work, was a reply to the Priscillianist, Dictinius, who had defended lying in a writing entitled "*Libra*" (scales). Saint Augustine's teaching is extremely firm On this point, and opposed to that of Cassian who permitted lying in certain circumstances³. For Augustine, lying is always forbidden. He carefully distinguishes it from joking, silence, figures of speech, fiction, and also from error, even deliberate error: a lie is a statement at variance with the mind, with the intention of saying what is false and causing to be accepted as true something which is not so. Truth is like the chastity of the soul⁴: lying outrages it and nature herself protests, for liars themselves hate to be deceived⁵. But all lies are not equal in gravity: Saint Augustine distinguishes six kinds, from the more serious, i. e., the religious lie or simulated apostasy, to the officious lie in the interest of another⁶.

b) Five opuscula deal with marriage and with continence ^Λ These are:

1) *De continentia* (395): sermon on the struggle which naturally attends a life of continence.

2) *Dé bono conjugali* (400): the most complete patristic treatise on the duties of husband and wife.

3) *Liber de sancta virginitate* (400): continuation of the foregoing: defence of virginity.

4) *Liber de bono viduitatis* (414): exhortation on the merits and virtues of widowhood.

5) *De conjugii adulterinis, ad Pollentium* (419): on the indissolubility of marriage.

Augustine claims that virginity and continence are superior to marriage⁸, against Jovinianus, who exalted the latter and charged the Catholics with disparaging it. Augustine answers this latter objection in the *De bono conjugati*, by refuting the Manichaeans who affirm⁹ that the procreation of children was evil. Augustine strongly affirms that this purpose is lawful and in itself renders marriage good (he hesitated to admit the second end of marriage: *sedanda concupiscentia*)¹⁰. In the Pelagian controversy he had to make a stand against the theoriel of Julian of Eclanum, who declared that the movements of concupiscence which accompany the union of the sexes are good: these disorderly movements are the consequence of original sin¹¹. Christian marriage is indissoluble; it subsists even in the case of adultery¹².

¹ ^Λ 40, 517-548.

³ See the abstract in B. Roland-Gosselin, *La morale de S. Augustin*, p. 127-141. — ³ See above, p. 596.

⁴ *Animi castitas in veritate servanda est. De mend.*, vu, to.

⁵ This is one of the guiding notions of Augustinian teaching.

⁶ It was through fear of lying that Augustine refused to admit Saint Jerome's explanation of the incident of Antioch. See above, p. 578.

⁷ *De mend.*, 4^o, 349-372: 2) 343-396; 3) 397-421; 4) 429-450; 5) 451-486.

⁸ *De bono conj.*, c. xxii-xxiii, 27-31; *De sancta virg.*, c. I, 1.

⁹ *De bono conj.* c. V, vi; *De nupt. et concupi* bk. I, c. XV, 17.

¹⁰ *De nupt. et concupi* bk. I, c. viii, 9; c. xxii, 24.

¹¹ *De conjugii adulterinis*. See for this whole question of marriage, T. TIXK4 RONT, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 424-428.

c) The remaining moral opuscular treat of diverse subjects :

1) De opere monachorum (400): monks must combine work and prayer.

2) De cura pro mortuis gerenda : usefulness of prayers for the dead, especially Holy Mass, celebrated near the tombs of the martyrs.

3) De patientia (before 418) : patience is a gift of grace.

4) De symbolo ad catechumenos (4 sermons; the first alone is probably authentic).

5) De disciplina Christiana.

6) De cantico novo.

7) De utilitate jejunii.

8) De urbis excidio (about 410).

The last six are discourses.

The *Speculum de Scriptura Sacra* (427) may be classed with these writings : it is a simple collection of moral sayings drawn from the Scriptures, according to the order of the Books of the Bible. This *mirror* of the divine law was intended for pious edification. It became very popular.

IV. PASTORAL WORKS : EXEGESIS, PREACHING.

A) Two works of a theoretical nature must first be mentioned in this class.

1) The *De doctrina Christiana*¹, begun in 397 (bks. i-πi) and finished in 427 (bk. tv), is a complex work in which three parts may be distinguished : a) a doctrinal synthesis (bk. 1); b) a treatise on hermeneutics (bks. II-III); c) a treatise on homiletics (bk. tv). Book I was intended to serve as an introduction to the study of the Scriptures and gave a summary of the dogmatic (ch. 5-22) and moral (23-24) teaching of the Bible. The guiding principle of this admirable synthesis is the distinction he establishes from the very beginning between *frui* (*amore alicui rei inhærrere propter seipsam*) et *uti* (*referre rem ad id quod amatur obtinendum*); hence the great moral rule : *solo Deo fruendum* : and an essential rule in exegesis : the development of the spirit of charity. But this rule alone is insufficient.

Books II and III explain the other conditions necessary for a proper understanding of the Holy Scriptures : first, the knowledge required by the exegete (languages and related sciences), bk. π; then the rules proper to exegesis, bk. in : here Augustine first proposes the theory of the plurality of the literal sense⁴, which is now universally rejected, and brings the book to an end with an explanation of the seven rules of Tychonius⁵.

¹ All in *P. L.*, 40. — ² *P. L.*, 33, 887-1040. — ³ *F. I.*, 34, 15-122.

⁴ *De doct. Christ.*, bk. III, c. XXVII, 38. *Confess.*, bk. XII, c. XXXI, 42. F. Talon (*Rech. Sc. Rel.*, 1921, p. 1-28) pleads in favour of another interpretation of these texts.

⁵ See above, p. 391.

Book IV is a treatise on preaching : although he does not despise the resources of eloquence, Augustine asks of the preacher that he should be above all "divinarum Scripturarum tractator et doctor".

2) De catechizandis rudibus' (400), addressed to the deacon, Deo-gratias, is a theoretical and practical treatise on the manner of instructing catechumens and the people in general. Augustine indicates a way of combating apathy, of which he enumerates the six causes (n. 1423) and ends by giving two models of instructions (n. 24-50 and 51-55).

B). Exegesis.

It was natural that one of Augustine's turn of mind should be drawn to *Alexandrian*, spiritualist *exegesis*, and it is a fact, says Bardenhewer, "that he does not really feel at home, except in the wide field of mystical and allegorical interpretation 23, especially in his sermons and pious works. In this kind of exegesis he has no equal. It is a mistake, however, to think that he neglected the *literal sense*. He desired, on the contrary, that greater care should be taken in determining the true Scriptural senses, and that all risky and unscientific interpretations should be avoided. He even reproaches himself with an abuse of the allegorical sense in certain of his commentaries in which he would have done better to keep more to the letter. Saint Augustine's *Commentaries* do not reach the level of Saint Jerome's, neither as regards their extent nor their scientific character, says Portalié, who attributes their inferiority to three causes 4: 1) his ignorance of Hebrew and little knowledge of Greeks; 2) the abuse of the mystical sense for moral and practical purposes; 3) the ardent passion and prodigious subtilty with which he engaged in controversy. This judgment, however, must be tempered according to the different works 6.

I. The beginning of the world interested Saint Augustine over a long period.

' J. L., 40, 309-348. — ■ *Patrol.*, II, p. 423.

3 He gives the rules in *De doct. Christ.*, bks. II-III. See also *De Gen. adlitt.*, bk. I, c. xix-xxi. He adheres to these rules in his *Commentaries*. See below, p. 656, n. 3.

4 E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2343-2344.

s See, however, S. Salaville, *La connaissance du grec chez S. Augustin*, in *Echos d'Orient*, 1921, p. 387-393.

6 Saint Augustine attributed exceptional authority to the Greek text of the Septuagint, which he regarded as inspired; but he cited the Latin version current in the West. On the so vexed question of the */tala*, to which the *De doct. Christ.*, gives rise in bk. II, c. XV, 22, see A. d'Alès remarks in *Rech. Se. Rei.*, 1921, p. 214-219.

On four occasions he commented the first chapters of Genesis; first in pious vein: *Confessions* (bks. xi-xm); for controversial purposes: *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 388-390 (too allegorical); lastly as a properly exegetical commentary, from 393, in the *De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus*, which he found impossible to achieve at the time but which he continued later in the *De Genesi ad litteram* in 12 books written from 401 to 415, and which form his "ultimate work of literal exegesis on the story of the beginning of the world". Among the many digressions present in this work should be mentioned books vi, vn and X, consisting of almost a complete treatise of Anthropology, and book XII which deals with ecstasies and visions.

2. In the same class of critical and scientific studies on the Scriptures, Saint Augustine has also left the following:

d) The *Locutiones* (in *Heptateuchum*) * (419), 7 books;

ç) the *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* † (419), 7 books;

c) the *Adnotationes in Job* ‡ (400);

d) the *De consensu Evangelistarum* § (400), a noteworthy attempt at reconciling the apparent contradictions of the Gospels; the exaggerated subtlety of certain solutions does not affect the value of the work taken as a whole.

The *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* are moral and mystical in tone rather than strictly exegetical.

3. The Commentaries properly so called on the New Testament are few, but important.

a) The 2 books *De sermone Domini in monte* », which resume Saint Augustine's preaching while he was still a priest, 391-396, deal with Matth. V-VII, together with the other sayings of the Saviour: this work, says Portalié, is an admirable, suave and penetrating synopsis of Christ's moral theology.

ç) The *tractatus CXXIV in Joannis Evangelium* † consists of homilies preached in 416. This complete commentary of the Gospel of the Word, which although it treats chiefly of dogma does not neglect its moral teaching, is "rightly classed among Augustine's principal works: here Arians, Pelagians and Donatists are refuted one after the other". (Portalié). To this commentary should be joined the *Tractatus X in I Epist. Joannis* ", dating from the same year, in which Saint Augustine eloquently treats of the great commandment of the love of God and our neighbour, and against the Donatists, of the great law of unity which results therefrom.

c) On *Saint Paul* there are extant two attempted commentaries (*expositio*) and one complete commentary:

i. *Expositio quarundam* — 84 — *propositionum ex Epist. ad Romanos*": a collection of answers to questions put by the monks of Hippo (394);

† P. L., 34, 173-220. — A. I., 34, 219-246. — 3 34, 245-486.

4 P. L., 34, 485-546. — 5 P. L., 34, 545-824. — 6 P. L., 34, 825-886.

i P. L., 34, 1041-1230. — 8 P. L., 35, 1321-1364. — » P. 34, 1229-1308.

» P. L., 35, 1379-1976. — " P. L., 35, 1977-2062. — " P. L., 35, 2063-2088.

2. *Epistolæ ad Romanos Expositio inchoata* 1 (394);

3. *Expositio Epistolæ ad Galatas* 1 (394), a true commentary and methodical endeavour to determine the literal sense. This work makes one regret that Augustine did not comment the whole of Saint Paul's 1

C) Preaching.

Saint Augustine's oratorical work is, together with that of Saint John Chrysostom, the most voluminous of all that Christian antiquity has bequeathed to us. In addition to the *tractatus* on Saint John, of which we have written above 4, it comprises a double series of discourses: familiar homilies, termed *Enarrationes*, and *Sermons* strictly so called.

1. In the first class, Saint Augustine has left about 200 homilies; these are the *Enarrationes* in *Psalmos* 8, which must be taken rather as oratorical compositions than as exegetical works 6, "masterpieces of popular eloquence, of inimitable liveliness and originality" 7 and deeply imbued with the spirit of Christian life. Some of these homilies were never preached. They formed the life work of Augustine and it is impossible to be sure of the date of the composition. It is known, however, that the 32 homilies on Ps. 118 were composed after 4158.

2. The sermons properly so called, of which the authenticity was recognised by the Maurists, number 363. They may be classed under four heads:

a) *Sermones de Scripturis* 9 (1-183), or isolated Scriptural passages: they are classed according to the order of the Bible: 1 to 50 on the Old Testament (there are more than 20 on verses from the Psalms); 51 to 148 on the Gospels; 149 to 183 on the Acts and the Epistles.

ç) *Sermones de tempore* 10 (184-272): twenty on the Nativity and Epiphany, the same number for Lent (including the famous instructions *In traditione* and *In redditione symboli*), more than thirty for Easter, and ten on the Ascension and Pentecost.

1 *P. L.*, 35, 2088-2106; a work abandoned by the author on account of its difficulty. — 2 *P. L.*, 35, 2105-2148.

3 Father Lagrange writes concerning these attempts at commenting the Epistle to the Romans: "These two works do not hinder us from thinking that it is greatly to be regretted that Augustine did not compose a complete commentary of the Epistle to the Romans. Such a work would have been the masterpiece of early commentaries. Perhaps also in such a study, which must necessarily have followed closely the Apostle's chain of thought, Augustine would have tempered certain of his interpretations which keep too much to the letter, and to phrases which are cut on from their context. It is nevertheless true that Augustine, better than any other early writer, penetrated Saint Paul's ideas and assimilated his doctrine". *Saint Paul, Épttre aux Romains*, p. IX.

4 This work, like the *De sermone Domini*, was an oratorical work. The two together contain some 150 discourses.

5 *P. L.*, 36, 67-1028 (Ps. 1-79), 37, JO33-1966 (Ps. 80-150).

6 Some of them, however, are not homilies; for instance those which treat of Psalms 67, 71, 77. — 7 E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, 2301.

8 See E. BOUVY, *S. Augustin, Les Enarrationes sur les Psaumes*, in *Rev. August.*, t. in, (1903), p. 418-436. — 9 *P. L.*, 38, 23-994. — 10 *P. L.*, 38, 995-1247,

c) *Sermones de sanctis* (273-340): several sermons are devoted to certain saints: St. Vincent, 4; Saint John the Baptist, 7; SS. Peter and Paul, 5; St. Laurence, 4; S. Cyprian, 5; St. Stephen, 6; etc.

d) *Sermones de diversis* (341-363): deal chiefly with moral subjects: fear, charity, peace, clerical life, etc. In addition maybe mentioned two long sermons (361, 362) on the resurrection of the dead.

To these the editors add some thirty *doubtful sermons* (364-396). They have also carefully distinguished all these discourses from the long series of *apocryphal sermons* which number no less than 317.

Since the great Benedictine edition other of Saint Augustine's discourses have been found to be authentic, or have been published by various critics:

a) 25, edited by Michel Denis⁵, 1792.

b) 10, edited by Frangipane⁶, 1819.

c) 4, edited by Fontani⁷, 1793.

rf) 33, edited by Dom Morin⁸, 1917. To these must be added a number of other discoveries made by Dom Morin himself⁹ and Dom Wilmart¹⁰. These gradually accumulating additions bring to nearly 450 the number of properly so called authentic sermons of the great Christian orator of the West.

Saint Augustine, although so occupied in many ways, has left an oratorical work almost equal in extent — by the number of discourses, if not by their length — to that of Saint John Chrysostom, and the fact that such a comparison is possible is significant. There is nothing to choose between the masterly treatment¹¹ of these two Doctors, in spite of very evident differences: "Although the doctor predominates in Augustine, as an orator, while possessing less of Saint John Chrysostom's colourfulness, wealth of expression and oriental charm, he has nevertheless a more vigorous logic, bolder comparisons, a greater nobility and depth in his ideas; and sometimes even in his heartfelt outpourings and forceful dialogues he equals the irresistible power of the Greek orator¹²".

Not all, of course, possesses the same value in this immense work¹³, which more often than not was improvised and preserved only by the stenographers' notes. But it does at

⁵ P. L., 38, 1248-1484. — ³ P. L., 39, 1493-1638.

⁶ P. L., 39, 1639-1718. — ⁴ P. L., 39, 1735-2354. — ⁵ P. L., 46, 813-940.

⁷ P. L., 46, 939-1004. — ⁸ P. L., 47, 1113-1140.

⁸ S., *Aur. Augustini tractatus sive sermones inediti*, Kempten-Munich, 1917.

⁹ *Rev. binid.*, 1922, p. 1-13.

¹⁰ *Rev. binili.*, 1912, p. 148-167; *Rev. Asc. Myst.*, 1921, p. 351-372.

¹¹ See above, p. 482.

¹² E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, col. 2305.

¹³ A number of shortcomings will be mentioned below, art. in, p. 661.

least give us a clear notion of the way Augustine conceived Christian preaching. No doubt, as he himself tells us, he is nearly always dissatisfied with what he says: "I aspire to do better and usually I take an interior pleasure in it before trying to render it in resounding words: and if I perceive that they fail to translate my ideas adequately, I am saddened to see that my tongue is unable to satisfy my heart ! But such powerlessness is but relative, and that which we still possess of Saint Augustine's great and splendid oratory, makes it easy for us to understand his method. Moreover, he himself explains the principles 2 of which his work is but the application 3.

He recognises the evident utility and even the absolute necessity of an education in oratory at the school of the rhetors 4, which he himself frequented for so long. After this first preparation, however, he desires that the preacher should pay less attention to eloquence in the strict sense of the word than to wisdom 5, whose secrets he will find in the Scriptures 6*. Moreover the wisdom taught by the Holy Scriptures is inseparable from true eloquence 7. From the three precepts to which Cicero reduces the whole of eloquence, *docere, delectare, flectere* Saint Augustine draws a general rule for the Christian orator: he should speak in such a way that he is heard *intelligenter*, thanks to the clarity of his teaching, *libenter*, an account of the suavity of his diction, *obedienter*, on account of the strength which bends the will 9; his preaching should be by turns *humble*, so that he may instruct, *moderate*, so that he may please, and *noble*, so that he may convince. Indeed, unlike profane orators, the Christian preacher treats only of noble subjects 10, and if his life is in keeping with his preaching he will find it easy to convince his hearers ". Lastly, there is a great law which guides all these precepts, and even comes before *charity*; that is *truth*: the preacher must speak so that truth may be manifested and please and touch his hearers 12. By his

¹ *De catechiz. rudibus*, c. 11, 3.

³ In the *De doctrina Christiana*, book IV, written by St. Augustine at till end of his life in 427, and consequently the fruit of his long experience.

⁵ See G. LoNGHtYE, *La prédication*, p. 164-189.

⁴ *De doctrina Christiana*, bk. IV, c. I-IV, 1-6. — ⁵ *Ibid.*, c. V, 7-8.

⁶ *Ibid.*, c. VI, 9-10. — ⁷ *Ibid.*, c. VII, 11-12. — ⁸ *Ibid.*, c. XII, 27 sq.

⁹ *Ibid.*, c. XVII, 34 sq. — ¹⁰ *Ibid.*, c. XVIII, 35 sq.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, c. XXVII, 59 sq.

¹² *Ibid.*, c. XXVIII, 61.

advice, together with the example he has set, Augustine is one of the foremost masters of the Christian pulpit, and even in the pulpit he glories in remaining still the *Doctor*.

V. LETTERS — RETRACTATIONS — APOCRYPHAL WORKS.

The edition of Saint Augustine's correspondence comprises 270 pieces, distributed in four classes by the Benedictines: *a) Epist.* 1-30: before the episcopate; *b) Epist.* 31-123: from the episcopate until 411; *c) Epist.* 124-231: from 411 to his death; *d) Epist.* 232-270: undated letters, later than 411. From these 270, however, must be subtracted 53 letters written by Augustine's correspondents. "This correspondence is of the greatest value as regards the knowledge of the life, influence and even the doctrine of the Bishop of Hippo. Purely familiar letters occupy but a restricted space. The majority treat of philosophical, dogmatic and moral questions.

Some of these letters form veritable opuscula. Among the most instructive may be mentioned the following groups³: On philosophy and the Pagans (118; 16, 17, 50, 91, 102), on the Trinity (120, 169, 170, 238-242), on the presence and the vision of God (187; 92, 147, 148), on the Incarnation and Mary (11, 12, 137, 144, 161, 162, 169), on grace (186, 194, 217), on the obligations of bishops and priests (21, 22, 29, 142, 208, 228, 266), Christian fervour and perfection (26, 112, 127, 130, 132, 145, 155, 189, 220, 243), on the religious life (48, *monachis*; 211, *manilibus*; 150), etc. Several letters have been wrongly attributed to Saint Augustine, notably the letter from *Pelagius to Demetrius* (year 413), a letter which Augustine declares is tainted with heresy⁴.

The *Retractations* (this word signifies *revision* rather than disavowal) are an indispensable guide to Augustine's work and the development of his ideas: written between 426 and 428, they contain the enumeration of the author's 94 works⁶, and indicate the purpose, the circumstances and guiding idea of each one: to this are added any necessary rectifications and precisings. The work comprises two books: the first deals with the 27 books written before he

¹ *P. L.*, 33, 61, 1094. — * *E. Portalie, op. cit.*, col. 2287.

³ On Saint Augustine's correspondence with Saint Jerome, see above, p. 577 sq.

⁴ *P. L.*, 33, 1099-1120. From this letter were drawn certain expressions attributed to Augustine, and which became proverbial in spirituality, says *G. Pourrat (op. cit., p. 297)*, notably this: "Non progredi, iam reverti est" (e. xxvii). The equivalent of this expression, however, is found in Saint Augustine (*Senn.*, 169, 18).

⁵ *P. L.*, 32, 583-656. — ⁶ Several of these are lost.

became bishop (from the *Contra Academicos*, c. I, to the *De mendacio*, c. XXVII); the second treats of the 67 composed while he was a bishop (from the *Ad Simplicianum*, c. I, to the *De correptione et gratia*). The *De predestinatione* and *De bono perseverantiae* had not yet been composed. The author himself introduces his work in a modest *Prologue*.

Apocrypha. In spite of Saint Augustine's care in giving a complete list of his works, a number of treatises have been wrongly attributed to him; especially false sermons. The editors were obliged to prune 317 of these from the collection of his works x. Others probably still exist in the manuscripts.

ARTICLE III. THE DOCTOR.

I. THE MAN AND THE SAINT.

A). The Man.

It has been said of Saint Augustine that he "is one of the men who have most honoured mankind 2", He is certainly, to judge by the extent and the wealth of his work, his profound teaching and powerful originality, not less than by the manifold gifts which enabled him to be so active in such diverse domains, the greatest genius the Church has ever possessed.

He was endowed with a lively and acute intelligence; the most *abstract* problems held no terrors for him, and when necessary he was quite capable of dealing with *practical* issues and purely erudite subjects 3. Although his was naturally an intuitive mind, instinctively drawn to the highest forms of metaphysics, he was hardly less at ease in the realm of *dialectics*; he was thus a redoubtable and feared controversialist. He set his mark, as a profound and original *thinker*, on all the problems with which he dealt, anti although he did not furnish new and final solutions to some; of them, he shed on all of them a flood of light, sometime. i merely by his manner of envisaging them. As an outstanding *psychologist* he brought extraordinary subtlety and an almost; unequalled acuteness of observation to bear on the analysis

1 P. I., 39, 1735-2354.

3 P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. lat. chrit.*, p. 131.

3 In this respect, however, he was surpassed on the whole by Saint Jerome.

of the soul — his own and every soul — and to the study of the problems to which such an analysis gives rise. These intellectual powers were powerfully abetted by an excellent and trustworthy *memory* ¹, and an unremitting application to *work*, which poor health was never allowed to interrupt and which death alone brought to an end.

The profession of rhetor which he exercised for a considerable period enabled him to develop his natural aptitude for *oratory*, and to acquire a very extensive classical culture. A born *writer*, endowed with a brilliant imagination and deep feeling which give life and movement to his writing, he is especially remarkable for the nobility and elevation of his *style* and his ideas, although it sometimes happened that he used a more popular form of expression better adapted to his hearers ². What is most striking in Augustine is perhaps that suppleness of talent which enabled him to adopt the most divergent styles according to the subject he was treating ³. In his first writings he was particularly attentive to his style, but later he lavished more care on the matter. Although at this time his principal motive was to edify and do good, his writings reveal the great scholar on every page.

From a moral point of view, once Augustine had overcome those ardent passions which had for some time dominated him, he combined in himself the most divergent qualities. Pride and ambition gave place to a charming and most ingenuous humility ⁴. To an exquisite sensibility he united the utmost delicacy in all his actions. Generous and sympathetic he won many friends to whom he always remained faithful; moreover, there was nothing exclusive in his

¹ He speaks, in the *Confessions*, of the vast palace of the memory (*lata fratoria memoria*), bk. X, n. 12. See *ibid.*, 26. The truth of this remark was probably inspired by his own experience.

² He has been reproached, and not without cause, with an exaggerated use of subtlety, of studied antitheses, of deliberate alliteration. These puns, which constitute one of the foibles of Augustine's great intellect, are particularly noticeable in his oratorical work, where their purpose — and their excuse — was to divert his pious hearers.

³ "Nothing resembles so little his teaching or exegetical style as his narrative, controversial or homiletic style. The carefully weighed phrases of the *City of God*, usually balanced with an almost classical rhythm, have nothing in common with the almost romantic, vibrating and picturesque, lyric and breathless phrases which give the tone to the *Confessions*. And this is not the *least* surprise that is reserved to students of Augustine's works". P. Monceaux, *Hist. litt. lat. chrét.*, p. 138.

⁴ See the *Confessions*. He admired "the humility of God" in the Incarnation. *enchirid.*, c. cvm.

affections, which he lavished more especially on the poor and the lowly. With this amiability Augustine also allied tolerance for the failings of others¹ and an absolute frankness in his relations². His great strength of character did not hinder him, when necessary, from displaying the suppleness and skill of the true diplomat. Adroit, tenacious and tactful, he was well fitted to occupy a place of authority, as indeed he did³, in that sphere which was peculiar to him and which made of him a leader of souls.

All these virtues flourished in his soul under the influence of grace, and notably that queen of virtues, charity, which seems to shine forth in his works with an especial brilliance, and which posterity has particularly admired in his life and writings. In all ages, the instinct of Christendom has recognised in him the "Doctor of charity", and it has not been at fault. But it should be remarked that this charity, which, as has been said, nourished Christian piety through the centuries in the West, and which notably created the fertile mystical school which inspired all the spirituality of the beginning of the Middle Ages, was not a mediocre, ordinary virtue; it was charity nourished by the eminent mystical gifts of contemplation.

B). The Contemplative.

That Saint Augustine was a contemplative in the strict sense explained above⁴ is abundantly proved by the *Confessions* and the importance of this proof cannot be too highly stressed. In this work the author not only reveals the state of his soul at the beginning of his episcopate, but also the various stages which led up to it. It is as a contemplative, wholly plunged in the consideration of the greatness of God and his own weakness, that he envisages his past life and his present state. Many of these pages are written contemplations, uninterrupted and sublime elevations to God. In spite of his modesty, Augustine avows that he has been vouchsafed divine favours. That which he had

* The couplet which he had engraved on the walls of the refectory of his monastery is well known :

Quisquis amat dictis absentum rodere vitam
Hanc mensam vetitam noverit esse sibi.

■ See above, his Correspondence with Saint Jerome, p. 577.

³ See his Correspondence.

⁴ See the Introduction, p. 22-25.

at Ostia with his mother¹ was but one of many, for in book X, where he speaks of the state of his soul, about the year 400, he cries : "Et aliquando intromittis me in affectum multum inusitatum introrsus, ad nescio quam dulcedinem, quæ si perficiatur in me, nescio quid erit quod vita ista non erit"²,

But even apart from this explicit declaration, the whole of Augustine's works must lead to the same conclusion. They will be understood but imperfectly, and even perhaps entirely travestied, if the point of view which the author usually adopts, after his conversion, is misunderstood. It was the outlook, not of a philosopher nor of a theologian as such, but of a contemplative who at the same time was an eminent philosopher and theologian and above all a saint, wholly given to God in charity, entirely penetrated by God by the grace of the Holy Ghost, and seeing everything that he studied in relation to God.

And first of all, God for him was not the abstract deity of the philosophers, but the most *living of realities*, no longer sought for, but present to his soul, and already partly possessed in joy and peace : the *inquietum est cor nostrum* is tempered by the *donec requiescat in te* ;³ he already enjoys this repose in some wise, according to the characteristic Augustinian expression : *frui Deo caritate*. He finds his nourishment in God, and thus he esteemed that having lost God in the past his heart had become "a country ravaged by famine"⁴. He calls God : *Deus meus, Pax mea, Vita mea, Patria mea...* Hence the term *Truth*, which Augustine so often uses of God, must be understood only as an indication of the purely spiritual nature of this God, Who is known only by the mind and in Whom, on the other hand, are perfectly realised the "intelligible ideas" of the Platonists.

Augustine discovers God in all His creatures : hence the eminent aspect from which he considers them ; he studies them in order to rise by *degrees* to their Creator. He sees them only as reflections of the infinite, as finite participations of the essential *Being*, the unchangeable *Truth*, the incorruptible *Good*. In them also he finds traces of the *Trinity*, that mystery which seems to hold for him a special charm, probably because he goes deeply into the very life of God, for this is a characteristic he shares with all the great mystics.

Saint Augustine's mysticism is of course well known. Portalié echoes the voice of tradition when he admires in Augustine's work *his passion for truth*, "the admirable combination of deep intellectuality and enlightened mysticism. For him (Augustine) *truth* is not merely a spectacle spread out for contemplation ; it is a good which must be possessed ; we must love it and live it. The genius of Augustine consists in his marvellous gift of embracing truth *with his whole soul*, not only by the heart, for the heart does not think, nor by the mind alone, for the mind apprehends but abstract and, as it were, moribund truth....

¹ *Confess.*, bk. IX, c. X, 23-26. — *Confess.*, bk. X, c. XL, 65.

² *Confess.*, bk. I, c. I, I.

³ *De doct. Christ.*, bk. I, c. iv, 4.

⁴ Et factus sum mihi regio egestatis. *Confess.*, bk. II, c. X, 18.

Saint Augustine is not a sentimentalist, a pure mystic¹, and the heart alone does not explain his power. In Augustine, the dry and cold intellectuality of the metaphysicians gives way to a *passionate vision of truth*, but this vision is at the root of everything. He never knew that vaporous mysticism of our times which allows itself to be lulled by a vague and purposeless sentimentality. For him *emotion* is deep, animated, enthralling, precisely because it is based on a firm, sure and precise *dogmatism*, desirous of knowing what it loves and why it loves. Christianity is *a life*, but a life lived in eternal and unchanging truth. No other Father has put so much of his heart into his writings as Augustine, and no other Father has looked on truth with a more lucid or profound mind².

This *acuteness* of intellectual vision contemplating the most spiritual of beings, this *realism* of the knowledge of God, which is revealed by the passion with which it is accompanied, are both explained by that one word, contemplation³, which shows us the depths of Saint Augustine's soul. And by this must be understood, not any ordinary contemplation, but *mystical* and *perfect*⁴ contemplation, which must often have been vouchsafed to him in prayer, in its *passive form*, and by which, in its *active form*⁵, he almost always benefited in his life as a Christian apostle and writer. Hence certain of his works are admirable spiritual elevations and true contemplative meditations⁶. This of course must be considered only as the external manifestation of a very pure and very ardent charity, but nevertheless a very real manifestation, having its source in his eminent and supernatural knowledge of God.

C) The Optimism of Saint Augustine.

Such a combination of intelligence and love, under the action of the Holy Ghost, explains the enthusiasm of the great Doctor's disciples and the influence he exercised in the Church⁷. And his influence was of the sort that cheers. There was nothing of the discouraged and indolent pessimist about Augustine. He was in the best sense of the word an *active man*. He wore himself out in all kinds of apostolic labours: administration, preaching, controversy, theological speculation, etc. In his work, in the practice of virtue, he spared himself nothing⁸. And from this moral point of view

¹ This "pure mystic" would seem to be nearly related to "false mystic".

² E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2453-2454.

³ See the Introduction, p. 22. — ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 24-25.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 24, and p. 25-28. — ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

⁷ See below, p. 713. — ⁸ See p. 695-698.

he was an optimist, a begetter of enthusiasm. He was no less an optimist in the *realm of theory*, the realm of principles; not of course that he thought everything for the best in the best of worlds, but he was pleased to stress the wisdom of God, Who is able to draw forth good from evil. And as for *man*, although Augustine forcefully describes the degree of his present degradation, it is but to lift him the higher and place him in the arms of his infinitely merciful Father; he indicates the remedies to evil, which are more than sufficient, an unlimited wealth of grace which allows the Christian to recover even the most essential of his lost privileges, notably the perfect image of God, which is restored to him by contemplative wisdom. All that, justifies for Augustine the most unreserved optimism²³ And since this optimism is in no way natural, but is based entirely on the grace, the goodness and the wisdom of God, it is all the more truly and divinely fruitful. It is a perfect reflection of the deepest convictions of the great Bishop of Hippo.

II. SAINT AUGUSTINE'S DOCTRINAL METHOD.

This method makes use of three distinct elements, which complete and supplement one another; 1) authority; 2) reason; 3) the heart.

A). Authority.

It is a striking fact that the Father of the Church who made the greatest use of reason in the quest of God was also he who placed most insistence on the necessity of putting authority at the base of all Christian life. He spoke from experience, for it was in this way that his own conversion began³. This authority, which has God Himself as its unique source, was considered by Augustine under three forms

¹ See the *De ordine* and all his anti-Manichaean work.

² Certain contemporary authors are inclined to speak of Saint Augustine's pessimism; but in so doing they can only justify themselves by giving to certain of Augustine's particular opinions, which have no connection with his teaching as a whole, the value of outstanding theses which they certainly did not possess, for Augustine. Moreover, such pessimism cannot be separated from his feeling of moral depression, which not only is not found in his teaching but is in itself in opposition to it. It must be admitted that certain fragmentary or incomplete explanations of his doctrine, which have sometimes been given in the past, justify only too well this unfavourable criticism. Augustine's consoling teaching on contemplation and wisdom seems well calculated to dissipate these prejudices.

³ See above, p. 617.

a) the *Holy Scriptures*, of which he admitted the entire canon, and which after him was accepted by the whole of the West: he taught that it was inspired¹, i. e., of divine origin, and defended its absolute inerrancy² which, he thought, excluded neither oversights, nor the putting of one word for another, nor the difference of the Evangelists' expressions when reporting the same discourse; b-) *tradition*, which completes Scriptural revelation, when it is Apostolic and universal, and which is transmitted either by some practice (for instance, infant baptism, which he invoked against Pelagius) or by the Creed or *regula fidei*. Saint Augustine established this *rule*, which was developed by Vincent of Lerins: "Quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditura"³; d) the *Church*, lastly, whose living authority Saint Augustine places above that of the Scriptures and tradition: "Ego vero evangelio non crederem, nisi me Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commoveret auctoritas"⁴; she guarantees the Scriptures, transmits tradition, interprets them both, and puts an end to controversy: whoever refuses to receive her teaching is a heretic⁵. Her magisterium is rendered infallible by the assistance accorded her by Christ through the Holy Ghost. Hence in his demonstration of the faith, Augustine endeavours above all to establish the *divinity of the Church* by miracles, prophecies, the great number of believers, and in particular the holiness of Christianity⁶.

B). Reason.

Reason occupies a vast place in Augustinian teaching. Firstly, it *prepares* the act of faith by proving the titles and the authority of the witness, which is the only true motive for intellectual adherence; but at the very root of all demonstration Augustine places the knowledge of Providence

¹ Like many others of his time, he wrongly believed the Septuagint to be inspired.

² See *De Gen. ad Utt.*, bk. VII, c. xxviii, 42; *Epist.* 82, c. I, 3 (to S. Jerome). See all the *De consensu Evangelistarum*.

³ *De baptismo*, bk. IV, c. XXIV, 31. Id teneamus quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est, says Saint Vincent of Lerins. *Commonitorium*, c. II.

⁴ *Contra Epist. Mani.*, c. V, 6. See L. de MondadON, *op. cit.*

⁵ See J. DE GUIBBERT, *La notion d'hérésie chez saint Augustin*, in *Bull. Utt. Eccl.*, 1920, p. 368-382.

⁶ The other aspects of Saint Augustine's doctrine will be studied on p. 670-672.

upon which the proof of the *divinity of the Church* is based ». Reason has its part in the *very act of faith*, for it must keep ever present to the mind the fact of the authority of the witness; and from this point of view Augustine has no hesitation in calling faith knowledge since it not only shows the object but also the reasons for believing in that object. Then, after the act of faith it is the function of reason to seek the inner understanding of the mystery; for though the faithful man must believe before having found the solution of all his difficulties, he must also subsequently endeavour to understand the dogma. Augustine gave a remote inspiration to that scholastic principle, *fides quærens intellectum*: he repeats incessantly that faith is the condition of the comprehension of revealed truths³; he exhorts the Christian to desire such understanding, to love it and to seek it through reason in the light of that wisdom which enlightens those pure souls which are filled with the love of God.

It was in *Platonic philosophy*, which he Christianised, that Augustine thought to find the intellectual culture most calculated to pierce the meaning of dogmas. The idea of truth occupies the central position in this philosophy⁴. Saint Augustine destroys scepticism by establishing a first certitude by the very fact of thought, which for any well balanced man is the object of evident and immediate perception. By means of the primary notions of the mind, but notably that of truth which guides all rational judgments, Augustine discovers God in himself, after having gradually risen⁵ to those heights where God resides, or rather presides⁶, for all those who would consult Him. And Augustine considers that this idea of truth comprehends not only *God*, the subsisting and sovereign Truth, but also the *creature*, the participation of creative Truth, and *knowledge*, the reflection of illuminating Truth, and *morality* itself: for good can only

¹ See *Confess.*, bk. VI, c. V, 7, 8. *De util. credend.*, c. XVI, 34.

³ *Epist.*, 147, c. in, 8.

³ *Nisi credideritis non intelligitis*. Isaías, vii, 9 (according to the Septuagint, faulty version). Saint Augustine often commented this text in its literal meaning. Sermon 43, in which it is explained, finishes with this significant phrase: *crede ut intelligas verbum Dei*. See below, p. 688.

⁴ See above, p. 643. Cf. Ch. Boyer, *L'idée de Vérité dans la philosophie de saint Augustin*. — ⁵ See below, p. 670 and 673.

⁶ Ubique Veritas, presides, omnibus consulentibus tc. *Confessions*, bk. X, c. XXVI.

be desired if it is previously known in some manner, and the last end can only be possessed through an act of the intelligence or mental vision |2 God is the Truth which beatifies. But beatification supposes love, just as, Augustine remarks, it is impossible fully to understand the good as long as it is not loved and desired. The philosophy of the Bishop of Hippo is essentially *intellectual*, like that of Saint Thomas, but this intellectuality, in the Augustinian doctrinal method, is combined with a strong current of love.

C) The Heart.

The heart, in fact, that is to say, love, plays an important part in the quest for a perfect understanding of faith. Augustine had learnt from the Platonist to seek truth with all the force of his soul (σὺν ὁλῇ τῇ ψυχῇ), and grace had perfected in him this tendency, by revealing to him the light in which God is pleased to bathe pure souls. He was always careful, therefore, to combine with the intellectual effort needful for the comprehension of truth the desire of loving it and causing it to be loved by others. It is important to recall this tendency, which is one of the characteristics of the Doctor of Charity, for it shows the essential distinction between his method and that of the Neo-Platonists, which consisted in pure and violent intellectuality: for Plotinus, love was hardly more than a simple form of the natural curiosity of the mind^a. For the Doctor of grace, the only love that counts is that *divine charity* which, produced by the Holy Ghost in souls, unites them to God, and even vouchsafes to them to taste and savour Him (*sapere*); it is this love which gives a powerful realism to the most spiritual of knowledge and raises it so much above the abstract and cold knowledge of the philosophers.

Thus the love which Saint Augustine incorporated in his doctrinal method is a supernatural love, which, by means of the gifts of wisdom and understanding accorded to purified souls by the Holy Ghost, enlightens the soul in an eminent way with regard to God and the mysteries. The part played by love justifies the term, *affective method*, which is usually employed when speaking of the great Doctor of Hippo.

¹ See *De civ. Dei*, bk. XXII, c. XXIX; *De Trinit.*, bk. I, n. 17, 20, 31, etc.

² R. Arnou, *Le désir de Dieu dans la philosophie de Plotin* p. 94-103. See above, p. 170.

This conception should not be made to include voluntarism in the strict sense of the word¹, since the point of view adopted by Augustine is theological and mystical rather than philosophical, and the influence of the will over Intelligence is infused rather than natural. The advantages of this method from a spiritual and ascetic standpoint are self-evident; they are no less valuable in the realm of theology.

III. AUGUSTINIAN THEOLOGY.

A). Notion of Theology.

Theology is thus defined by Saint Augustine in the *City of God*: "De divinitate rationem sive sermonem"² but in this text he is referring more directly to natural theology, the function proper to the philosopher, and more often than not, like Varro, he takes the word to mean *mythology*, with which he had dealt in preceding books, and which he subjects to severe criticism.

Theology in the proper sense of the word, or *supernatural* theology, he considers rather as: *the knowledge and understanding of faith, developed in the superior light of wisdom. Faith, in the speculative order, is crowned by spiritual understanding, and Saint Augustine exhorts all Christians to love and seeks this understanding. Faith comes first*⁴, but it should be completed by understanding. The latter itself, moreover, must be joined to the *knowledge of the faith* to which Augustine attributes (taking it in a wide sense as synonymous with theology) a fourfold function: "to produce, nourish, defend and strengthen the salutary faith which leads to true happiness"⁷. The first function is really a preparatory theological teaching, but the other three, which suppose an already existing faith, are those of theology in the proper sense of the word. Moreover,

¹ The ascetic tendency which insists on moral activity and on effort, even to acquire the superior graces of wisdom, is not voluntarism. In order to make this distinction quite clear we call this tendency *moralism*. See p. 30.

² *De Civ. Dei*. VIII, 1.

³ Hæc dixerim, ut fidem tuam *adamarem* intelligenti cohorter, ad quum nullo vera perducit, et cui fides animum præparat. *Ep.* 120, 6.

⁴ Intellectus enim est merces fidei; *Tract.* xxix in *Joann.*, n. 6.

⁵ See the beginning of the fine letter. No. 120, to Consensius, on the I riniy. See also above, p. 667, on the expression of the Septuagint, *zV/u ledidet ih.i. non intelligitis*.

⁶ See especially *De Trinitate*, bk. XIII. — *Ibid.* XIV, c. I, ll. 3,

understanding and knowledge do not here come to their full development without supernatural *wisdom*, which has God, the first and universal principle, for its proper and immediate object: by wisdom, God is, as it were, "seen" through contemplation'. Hence from this point of view theology may be defined as "wisdom" and classed with contemplation, that eminent knowledge of God through which wisdom is accorded 2.

For Saint Augustine, therefore, theology is doubly supernatural: first, by its object, revealed truth known by faith; secondly, in its perfect form by the light which derives from contemplative wisdom. For Augustine does not speak of an ordinary and natural wisdom, but of supernatural wisdom, which is neither the gift of wisdom, in its strict sense, nor the simple virtue, but a virtue which is perfected by the exercise of the gift, as may be seen by his teaching as a whole on this point, both here and in parallel passages 3.

B). Characteristics. The application of these principles, which Saint Thomas himself admitted, led Saint Augustine and his school to create a theological method somewhat different from that of the Angelical Doctor. Here will be indicated three of its chief characteristics: i) an affective tendency; 2) symbolism and the method of degrees; 3) a complexity of view-points.

1. Exhortations to prayer, and sometimes forms of prayer, are frequent in many of Saint Augustine's theological works. In this, he is not moved merely by religious feeling in order to sanctify his work, but acts on a definite plan in order to obtain the shedding of the superior light of wisdom on revealed truth. This tendency is properly *mystical* and does not suppose voluntarism. Augustine does not think of love as acting directly on the intelligence but as the Holy Ghost vouchsafing light and strength to those souls which are disposed to respond to His action.

2. The method of degrees is also characteristic of Augustinism. As a man who has a very real perception of God, Augustine seeks much less to demonstrate (inasmuch as this is possible) the truth of the mysteries than to *show* them, to make them visible, as it were, by means

1 *Ibid.*, XU, 21-25; XIII > *5> XIV > t-3-

2 See the definition, p. 23. An outline of truly Augustinian theology will be found in the first book of the *De doctrina Christiana* (397) or in the *Enchiridion*.

3 See F. Cayré, *La contemplation augustinienne*, ch. IX. Saint Augustine, speaking as a "practical" theologian, did not make the various distinctions we have indicated, but they are supposed by his teaching.

4 See above, p. 669.

of *symbols* which represent them. Such a method is perfectly legitimate since every being embodies an idea of God, and is, in a varying degree, an image of God. Augustine conceived the notion of forming a hierarchy of beings so that he might gradually approach the idea of God, which would be both concrete (showing Him by means of an image) and also very pure (this image becoming more and more spiritual in its nature¹). His attention was more especially drawn to transcendental notions (being; above all, truth; the good and the beautiful), which constitute the highest points of these degrees. He likes especially to consider them as the light and strength of the soul, and it is in this image, enlightened by wisdom, that he usually finds God. Contemplation is the vision of God seen in this image².

3. The complexity of view-points found in Saint Augustine, which must also be carefully noted. Instead of clearly distinguishing the realm of philosophy from that of theology, the natural order which is ruled by reason from the supernatural order where faith predominates, he seems rather to have *combined* them all without confusing them. Far from giving a careful analysis of what is proper to man as such, and to the believer as such, he possesses a habitual tendency to consider human nature on a supernatural background, on which in reality it was placed from the beginning, and on which by God's will it still remains in spite of the original fall. All his speculation is guided by *faith*, actually known by faith³. However much a philosopher he may be, he remains a *practical* philosopher, more inclined to build up than to dissect; tending to compare created beings in the light of God's action, rather than analyse them in order to consider them from any specialised aspect in themselves. This again must be regarded as an effect of *contemplation*. No doubt the latter gives direct enlightenment only as regards God Himself, but by a necessary consequence it links all things up with God, not only the Scriptures, Christ, the Church and the mysteries, but also all creatures, for they are all images of God Who is their end. In spite of his vast subtilty, Augustine's general method was *synthetic* rather than analytical.

Such a tendency was not without its dangers. The complexity of view-points sometimes renders difficult the access to his work, and those who are not forewarned may easily be deceived⁴. On the other hand, this superior, divine point of view, which gives unity to the whole, naturally lays stress on wisdom, even mystical wisdom, and on the advantages which reason itself thereby gains; hence if due care is not exercised two contrary and exaggerated consequences may be drawn. It may be concluded that reason is incapable of attaining certain natural truths (*apologism* is one of the forms taken by this species of scepticism)⁵, or, on the other hand, the force of reason may be unduly

¹ See art. IV, on the knowledge of God and the Trinity, p. 673 and 674.

² It is a "mediate vision". Moreover, the above mentioned image is the natural foundation. The true principles of contemplative knowledge are the infused lights of wisdom and understanding. See F. CAVITT, ch. VI: *La vision médiate*.

³ This remark partly explains the position he takes in the delicate question of predestination. See p. 690.

⁴ Hence the many doctrinal errors which claim to be based on it.

⁵ E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, col. 2510.

exalted, and even considered capable of demonstrating the mysteries themselves. Both these tendencies, especially the latter, were found in the theologians of the Middle Ages, disciples of Saint Augustine'. Saint Thomas opportunely distinguished the two points of view with great care. These exaggerations, however, must not be laid to Saint Augustine's charge. Although the distinction of the two orders of faith and reason is necessary to the student for the sake of clarity, their prudent combination is no less legitimate and useful from other points of view, and especially for the purpose of nourishing a solid piety, which was Augustine's ever present preoccupation.

ARTICLE IV. DOCTRINE.

I. GOD. THE MAN-GOD.

A). Existence and Nature.

The idea of God forms the centre of all Augustinian thought¹ God is not the object of direct intuition and immediate vision. Nevertheless Saint Augustine judges that His existence is so evident that it cannot be ignored,, except under the influence of passion; and even that is exceptional². And it is precisely the agreement of mankind on this point that forms one of his proofs³. Often he bases his demonstration on the beauty of the world and the order manifest therein⁴. Usually, however, he eloquently develops the metaphysical and psychological proofs. He is struck by the *changing* and therefore imperfect character of the beings that surround him, and is thus forced to seek higher for a being in whom truth, goodness and perfection are in no wise limited⁵. On the other hand, the necessary and universal character of those noble ideas which go to make the light and strength of the spiritual soul, those notions of truth and goodness which guide all its intellectual and moral activity, offer him still greater attraction, and more often than not it is by this psychological avenue that he

¹ T. Heitz, *Essai historique sur tes rapports entre la philosophie et la foi de Bérenger de T. à S. Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, 1909, p. 59, 80, 115.

² See above, p. 643.

³ *Insania ista paucorum est.* *Senn.*, 69, 3.

⁴ See *In Joann.*, tract, evi, 4.

⁵ *In Ps.* 41, 7. *Senn.*, 141, 2. *Confess.*, bk. X, c. vi, 9.

⁶ *Ecce sunt cæhim et terra : clamant quod facta sunt : mutantur enim atque variantur... Clamant quod seipsa non fecerint : Ideo sumus quia facta sumus.* *Confess.*, bk. XI, c. IV, 6.

comes to God*. Moreover, although these first principles are not absolutely innate², there is something so effortless, so spontaneous about them, that Augustine is nothing loath to attribute them to the action of God, Who is the principle of all knowledge, as He is the principle of all being. He insists more especially on this point, since these primary ideas, though simple, yet enable man to contemplate God already in this world, and even to see Him in some measure when they are illuminated by supernatural wisdom λ

These various proofs of the existence of God are rarely developed in rigorous form by Saint Augustine. More often than not they are incorporated in a kind of meditation on God, characteristic of both his spirituality and his theology, and which we will call the method of degrees. Augustine has often described it, but never so perfectly as in the *Confessions*. He numbers three stages, *a*) First, he considers *material creation*; after having admired its beauties, which cry aloud the name of the Creator, he finds them to be but rude images, and passes on δ in search of beings better fitted to show him the nature of his God.

In the second stage of his progress, he looks into his own *soul*. In his own mind, ornamented with its manifold knowledge (*memoria*) of which he brilliantly described the richness δ ; yet this very abundance constitutes a danger; man abandoned to the sea of his thoughts can never come to harbour, for God is not to be found in such multiplicity; Augustine rises still higher γ . *c*) He observes that at the very core of the troubled sea of the soul lies a firm and constant port: this is where resides the court of reason which judges all things according to truth; that *truth* which is the life of the mind and through which *goodness* is perceived. There, above the memory, resides the image of God in which He is already seen in this world, in which indeed He is truly found δ ! Then Augustine cries: "Sero te amavi, pulchritudo tam antiqua et tam nova! Sero te amavi! Et ecce intus eras et ego foris, et ibi te quærebam... Mecum eras et tecum non eram". This possession of God, if it is to include this already beatifying perfection, supposes in a certain measure* the light of contemplative wisdom γ , but it has nevertheless its starting point in an analogical yet sure knowledge of God and His perfections.

\dagger *De libero arbitrio*, bk. II. c. III-XIV, 7-38. *De div. q. iust.*, i. x x x iii, q. 54, *Confess.*, bk. VII, c. x, 16. *hi Ps.* 41. 8. See C. Boyer, *L'Idée de Vérité*. p. 47 sq. — * On the origin of these ideas, see above, p. 643.

γ *De div. f.uest.*, LXXXIII, q. 46, *De ideis. De Trinit.*, bk. Vili and xtv.

δ *Conf.*, bk. X, c. VI-XXVII, 8-38, *P. I.*, 32, 782-795.

δ *Ibid.*, VI-VII, 8-II. — γ *Ibid.*, VIII-XVII, 12-26.

γ *Ibid.*, XVII, 26.

δ *Ibid.*, xx-xxvi, 29-37.

γ *Ibid.*, XXVII, 38.

δ Either in the intense form described by Augustine in the meditation nt Ostin (*Confess.*, bk. IX, c. X, 23-26), or in the attenuated form as found in the *De Trinitate*, bk. XIV.

* See below, p. 687.

The divine attributes which especially attracted Saint Augustine's attention are, together with that of the *perfect* and unchanging Being, those of *Truth* and *Goodness*. This conception of God, which follows from what has already been said of the proofs on His existence, is well rendered by the following expression, reminiscent of Platonism. God is "*et causa subsistendi, et ratio intelligendi, et ordo vivendi*"¹. God is the *Perfect Being*, with a perfection which excludes all change, unlike all other beings which receive from Him all they possess. Nevertheless Augustine is still more drawn by the aspect of truth and goodness in God. God is *Truth* in Himself, since in God there is no difference between the idea and its realisation; God is *Truth*, also with regard to all creation, since He is the principle of all the truth which resides in created being, and of all the knowledge possessed by created minds². He is *Goodness*, in Himself and outside Himself, for all He has made is good, and for His reasoning creatures He constitutes the supreme rule of moral good and the principle of all supernatural good³. With truth and goodness is linked up *wisdom*, which occupies a great place in Saint Augustine's thought. To this divine attribute he finally reduces all the others in a famous page of the *De Trinitate*

B). Trinitarian Doctrine.

Saint Augustine's doctrine on the Trinity is well known to us from the great work he devoted to this mystery. Unlike the majority of the Fathers who preceded him, he treated this great subject not so much as a controversialist than as a theologian and contemplative, and opened up new avenues to speculative thought.

He differed from his forerunners by beginning his explanation of the dogma, not with the Father, considered as the source of the other two Persons, but with the one and simple divine nature which is the Trinity. This was an efficacious offset to Subordinationism⁵. Saint Augustine concludes from this principle: 1) to the unity of operation *ad extra*; 2) to the absolute equality of the Persons and to their

¹ *De Civit. Dei*, bk. Vili, c. IV. See *ibid.*, c. ix-x.

² See above (p. 643) in what sense this expression should be understood.

³ See the Anti-Manichaean and Anti-Pelagian writings.

⁴ *De Trinil.*, bk. XV, c. VI, 9.

⁵ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, p. 364.

circumincension; 3) to the necessity of speaking in the singular of all that concerns the nature and expresses anything absolute ». On the other hand, in order to avoid any trace of Modalism, Saint Augustine developed the *theory of relations*: "These Persons are relations², which are not to be confused with the substance or the nature, since they are not something absolute; but neither can they be called accidents, because they are essential to the nature and like it eternal and necessary... Thus of the Father it is said that He is *ad Filium*, while the Son is said to be *ad Patrem*, and the Holy Ghost *ad Patrem et Filium*"³. Everything possible had already been said regarding the generation of the Son, and Augustine could only repeat what his predecessors had said. With regard to the Holy Ghost, on the contrary, he was the first to give ample development to the procession *a Patre Filioque*, maintaining at the same time that He proceeded *principaliter* from the Father, the principle without source.

In this, of course, Augustine does hardly more than complete the work of those who went before him, but he also introduced a new kind of research on the great mystery. In order to provide a clearer and stronger idea of the Trinity, he not only desired that it should be accepted on the authority of the Scriptures, of which the data are simply accepted by reason, but he also wished to penetrate to the heart of the mystery by means of reason, not of course to give a complete rational demonstration, but in order to acquire a better understanding of its reasonableness, based on analogies. Already, in the *Confessions*, about 400, he had shown that man is the image of the Trinity by *esse, nasse* and *velle*.* In the *De Trinitate*, which he began about this time, he again treated the same idea and gave it ample developments. He now sought to understand the great mystery⁶ in the highest operations of the thinking soul, made perfect by contemplative wisdom⁷. He applied himself to this task with so much conviction that it sometimes seems that he wished to give a truly rational demon

¹ J. Tixeront, *of. cit.*, p. 364-365. — *De Trinit.*, bk. V.

² J. Tixeront, *of. cit.*, p. 365-366.

³ *Confess.*, bk. XIII, c. XI, 12.

⁵ See the abstract of the work, p. 645 sq.

⁶ See chiefly bk. XIV.

⁷ See bk. XV.

stration. But in reality he was well aware that his knowledge of the mystery was but analogical and imperfect. Some of his disciples in the Middle Ages showed less caution, and Saint Thomas's reminder of the proper role of reason with regard to the mystery, was extremely opportune¹.

C). The Work of God.

The world is essentially good, for it is the work of God. The *production* of the world, the work of the whole Trinity, is true creation *ex nihilo* (against the emanantisin of the Platonists)². It takes place *in tempore* (against the Origenists), or rather, says Augustine, *cum tempore*³, although the archetypes were eternally present in the mind of God. The whole universe was created *simultaneously*, not in its present state but in the condition of a *nebula* (*nebulosa species apparet*)⁴ containing, however, active principles (*seminal reasons*), the germs of future transformations and of the different forms that have been produced in the course of time. God conserves and guides the development of these principless.

Order reigns in the world, ruled by Providence. Even evil has its place; the supposed "*metaphysical evil*" is essential to created being⁵; physical evil is due to its weakness, and moral evil to the misuse of liberty. Order is therefore undisturbed. It is but one aspect of truth and being, and hence Providence is but an aspect of continued creation. This Providence, so well understood by Augustine, was "one of the most powerful of those beacons which constantly enlightened Saint Augustine's ideas", says Boyer⁶ And his teaching on grace is even a better proof of this assertion.

D). The Man-God ».

i). Christ is pre-eminently the *Way* which leads to God : Saint Augustine repeatedly reminds us of this fact. Also, especially in the *City of God*, he points to Christ standing at the very *centre* of the history of mankind, and still more at the centre of all Christian and religious life. In the years which had elapsed since his conversion⁷ Augustine had acquired an admirable understanding of the mystery of the

¹ See above, art. m., p. 672.

• Saint Augustine, says Portalié, always rejected the Platonic cosmogony» of which he refuted the six serious errors; *op. oil.*, col. 2329.

³ *De Civ. Dei* bk. XI, c. VI.

⁴ *De Gen. ad liti.* bk. I, c. XII, 27.

⁵ "The Doctor of Hippo was not thinking of evolution, but... if such were the case his system would furnish the theory of evolution with a rational and philosophical expression". Ch. Boyer {*L'Idée de Vérité*, p. 132).

⁶ But this expression would have had little charm for Augustine; he prefer[#] to stress the essential goodness of creatures. — ⁷ *ibid.*, p. 132-152.

⁸ With regard to Christ, Augustine considers the divine aspect before envisaging the mission of Our Lord. It is therefore at this stage of the doctrinal synthesis that a study of the Man-God should be placed. — ⁹ See above, p. 617.

Man-God. It is for this reason that, although he did not compose any work on this subject¹, he shed the greatest light upon it throughout all his works.

With regard to Christ's humanity, His divinity, and especially the union of the divine and human nature, not only did he steer clear of the current errors, but also, even before the inception of the great Monophysite and Nestorian controversies, he found the formulas which condemned these errors. Saint Leo borrowed them from him in the famous letter to Flavian (449) and their influence is patent in the so precise *Quicumque*. Later theology retained them. Certain ambiguous expressions (*mixtio*, *homo dominicus*, *homo* for *humanitas*)² are easily explained by reference to the context or to parallel passages. The only purpose of the comparison of the union of the body and soul in order to represent the union in Christ of divine and human nature, was to show the reality of the hypostatic union, and betrays no Monophysite leanings in Augustine.

Saint Augustine also vigorously accentuated the role of Christ as mediators. God became man to cure man's heart of pride, but also, and above all, to reconcile him with his God. He accomplished the first mission by His *humility*. No other Father insisted so strongly as Augustine on this moral aspect of the Incarnation, this "humility of God"³: it was a Divine Person, the Word of God, Who humiliated Himself. Christ accomplished the second mission in His *death*, which was a true expiatory sacrifice offered to the Father by virtue of a substitution⁴: Saint Augustine does not admit the theory of the rights of the devil⁵. This Redemption is universal?: it extends to all sins and to all sinners, but not to the fallen angels; those who are saved among men will fill the places left by the latter in heaven⁶.

¹ He dealt with it in letter 137 to Volusianus (*l. L.*, 33, 515-525), in the *De Trinitate* (bk. IV and XIII, c. x-xtx), the *De doct. Christ.* (bk. I, c. xi-xv), the *Enchiridion* (c. XXXIII-XLI), etc. See E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, cnl. 2361-2374.

² See above, p. 349.

³ *Enchirid.*, c. CVIII.

⁴ *Uthumana superbiaperhumilitatem Dei argueretur ac sanaretur.* *Enchirid.*, CVIII. See *De doct. Christ.*, bk. I, c. xiv, 13.

⁵ See *De Trinit.*, bk. XIII, c. XIVXVIII, 16-22.

⁶ See *ibid.*, c. xiv, 18. The ambiguous phrase in No. 19 is explained by his clear passage.

⁷ See below his teaching on grace and predestination.

⁸ *Enchirid.*, c. I.XI-I.XII.

2). Saint Augustine more than any other Father has stressed the *incomparable part* played by Mary in the Redemption. Since the Son of God came to save the whole of mankind, and took the masculine sex in His Incarnation, as was fitting, it was necessary for Him to be born of a woman in order to manifest also the salvation of the other sex¹³. Having been lost by a man and a woman, it was fitting that we should be saved in the same manner³. Moreover, Saint Augustine was well aware of the greatness of Mary's mission. The *Mother of God* must be a virgin *ante partum, in partu, and again post partum*⁴. She must be exempt from all sin; this latter is very general: "De qua (Maria), *propter honorem Domini*, nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quaestionem"⁵. This text evidently applies to all personal sins. It cannot be absolutely demonstrated that Augustine took it also to mean original sin, or that he explicitly refers to the privilege of the Immaculate Conception⁶⁷.

II. MAN. GRACE.

A). Man. Adam was not created in the present state of mankind. Saint Augustine's explanation of the original form of his body underwent a gradual change⁷. But, on the contrary, he affirmed from the very beginning that what are called the preternatural and supernatural gifts existed in the innocent Adam⁸⁹. Among these gifts of the first man may be mentioned, first, in his body, that of immortality⁹, and freedom from pain and infirmity¹⁰; then, in his soul, wisdom, infused knowledge, the domination of the senses¹¹, and perfect liberty (the *posse non peccare*), inferior to the *non posse*

¹ S. Protin, *La Cariologie de Saint Augustin*, in *Rev. Aug.*, 1902 (t 1), p. 375-396. A. Alverv, *Cariologie augustinienne*, *ibid.*, 1907 (t xi), p. 705-719.—» *De div. quæst.*, i. xxxm, q. xi.

³ *De Agone Christ.*, c. XXII, 24. —⁴ *Epist.*, 137, 8.

⁵ *De not. et grat.*, c. XXXVI, 42.

⁶ Another text (*Op. imp. cont. Jul.*, bk. tv, 122) is hotly discussed. See Ph. Friedriech, *op. cit.*, p. 183-233. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 471-472.

⁷ In the *De Gen. contra Munich.* (bk. II, c. vii-xm, 8-19), he conceives it not a material body more or less spiritualised.

⁸ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, n, p. 462.

⁹ *De Gen. ad Utt.*, bk. VI, c. XXV, 36.

¹⁰ *De Gen. ad Utt.*, bk. Vili, c. V, Ili

" *Cont. Jul. op. imp.*, bk. V, c. I.

peccare of the elect, but nevertheless greater than the freewill that remains to us, and which is characterised by the *non-posse non peccare*; lastly, justice, which supposes, together with the fundamental supernatural gift of sanctifying grace, the perfect righteousness of the mind (*mens*) of mkn, under the influence of supernatural wisdom x. These gifts were perfectly gratuitous; should Augustine sometimes call them *natural*, it is because he speaks from a *historical point of views*: "He troubles but little about what was possible, but about what had been and what is;... he takes man such as he was when he left the hands of God, and then as he became after his fall: what is natural is the work of God; the work of sin is not natural" a.

Although Augustine gives an allegorical commentary of the fall as related in Genesis, before he attempts any literal commentary, he never doubts the existence of original sin, which he proved by the Scriptures and tradition (writings of the Fathers and the practice of infant baptism), and lastly by the present physical and moral state of mans. He expressly stresses concupiscence, even to the point of assimilating it to original sin, of which it is an effect 4; but he specified that original sin consists in the *reatus concupiscentiae* (the guilt) which is effaced by baptism, and not in the *actus* (the fact) which remains 5. He nevertheless exaggerated the part played by concupiscence in the transmission of original sin, even to the point of seeming to say that it is not merely by the fact of birth that original sin is transmitted 6. It was this reason also that prevented him in his study of the origin of souls from subscribing wholeheartedly to Creationism ?.

The consequences of original sin, in addition to the pains of this life, are: i) the loss of perfect freedom (*libertas*), thanks to which, man was able to avoid evil and do good by

' *De Gen. ad liti.*, bk. III, c. xtx-xx, 29-32. *De Trinit.*, bk. XIV, c. XVI-XVII, 22-23. *Confess.*, bk. XIII, c. xxiii, c. xxn, 32. See p. 681.

2 J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 464. Baius, who took these affirmations absolutely literally, did not take into account other passages which indicate or suppose the supernatural or preternatural character of these privileges.

3 See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 467-472.

4 He calls it sin, but he adds: "Peccatum vocatur, non utique quia peccatum est, sed quia peccato facta est". *Cont. ꝑ ep. Pelag.*, bk. I, c. XIII, 27.

5 *De nupt. et concüp.*, bk. I, c. xxv-xxvi, 28-29.

6 Portalíé is of the opinion that this gross conception is to lie attributed much less to Augustine than to his disciples. *Op. cit.*, col. 2396-2397.

7 See above, p. 633.

means of a simple *auxilium sine quo non*; the free-will that remains to us cannot help sinning (freely) if it is not aided by a stronger grace which Augustine terms *auxilium quo volumus*. Elsewhere, it would seem that this necessity of sinning is a moral necessity *defacto*, rather than a necessity *dejure*, as Tixeront remarks.¹ 2) It follows from this that with the exception of Jesus Christ and His Mother² no one is without sin (at least venial sin) and the whole of mankind is a *massa damnationis*, *massa perditionis* ³ these are forceful but nevertheless exact expressions of the doctrine of original sin. 3) Children who die without baptism are damned, but their suffering is of the lightest⁴; this opinion is now universally rejected.

B). Justification. Sanctifying Grace.

Augustine defended the *reality* of sanctifying grace against the Pelagians, who reduced justification to barely more than the destruction of sin s. He taught that baptism truly effaces sin and does not merely “erase” it, as he was accused of saying: concupiscence remains, but strictly speaking it is not sin: and as for the “infirmity” of our fallen nature, it also is but an effect of sin and will gradually disappear. Sin is therefore destroyed, but justification supposes in addition a positive element, some reality inherent in the soul, as even the Protestants admit. Saint Augustine readily thought of it as a divine adoption⁵ or as a deification of the soul⁶, which is thus rendered an image of its Creator, more perfect than nature alone could make it and, lastly, as a participation in the very justice and holiness of God s. It is this image, lost by original sin, which is instantaneously restored to the soul at the moment of baptism, and which grows in perfection in the measure that the soul “is renewed

¹ *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 485-486, according to the *pece, merit, et rem.*, IV. II, c. III, 3; *De spiritu et Utt.*, XXVIII, 48. This necessity *de jure* is itself but a relative necessity. Moreover, Augustine calls sins, acts which are good in themselves, if they are deprived of the conditions required to render them meritorious and perfect. See below, p. 699.

² See above, p. 678.

³ *Enechirid.*, C. XXVI-XXVII.

⁴ *Mitissima sane omnium*; *Enchirid.*, c. XCIII.

⁵ J. Rivière, *Justification*, in *Diet, thiol.*, col. 2103-2105.

⁶ *De Serm. Dom. in monte*, I, XXIII, 7 & *Sermon* 126, 9.

⁷ *Sermon* 109, 5; 342, 5; *Enarr. in Es.*, XLIX, 2.

* *De Trinit.*, bk. XIV, c. XVI, XVII.

in the knowledge of God, that is to say, in the justice and holiness of truth”

In these latter texts, these effects are attributed to wisdom : elsewhere they are usually attributed to *charity*. The reason for this is that Saint Augustine makes little distinction between grace, which is the source of justice in the soul, and the virtues which flow from it, until complete perfection is obtained. He never forgets that man was perfect as he came from the hands of God, and that in so far as is possible he should become so again. This ideal is realised in great measure by charity, which achieves the union with God, especially when it is accompanied by wisdom in which Augustine seems to perceive some traces of those privileges of which man was despoiled by original sin². In order that this ideal may be realised Augustine exhorts man incessantly to renew himself interiorly by a veritable moral transformation. This explains why sanctifying grace, although it remains at the base of charity and wisdom, is kept in the background, and also why, even apart from the Pelagian controversy, *actual grace* is given such importance in Augustine's work.

C) Actual Grace 3.

I. Saint Augustine affirms, against the Pelagians, the existence of both *exterior* and *interior* graces. The latter are accorded either in the form of *illumination*, which reveals to us our duty, or in the form of *inspiration*, which affects the will and moves it to act. The Pelagians admitted chiefly the exterior graces, notably the Law and the Gospels, as well as the example of Jesus Christ. It is possible that they also recognised certain interior illuminative graces⁴; but they categorically denied the latter, asserting that to do and to accomplish depend solely on free-will⁵.

Saint Augustine considers that grace is necessary to man; first and foremost in the *supernatural order*, in order that he may *believe* revealed truths and give to his *acts* a supernatural goodness, and secondly, not only that in se

² *Ibid.*, XVII, n. 23. — ² See above, p. 678 and below, p. 688.

³ We have purposely refrained from any detailed explanation of the Augustinian doctrine on grace and predestination in order to avoid treating the theological systems which seem to us to be the result of later developments.

⁴ *De grat. Christ. et pece, orig.* → I, 8.

⁵ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, 443-445.

acts may be brought to their full perfection, but also that he may begin, and persevere, in good works ». In his refutation of Semi-Pelagianism he particularly stressed the necessity of grace for the beginning of faith, and also the grace of final perseverance²⁴. Even in the *natural order* he insists — at least for the accomplishment of the majority of the precepts on account of the infirmity of fallen man — on some supernatural aid, which, moreover, is not refused to the heathen, since for Augustine, whatever may have been said to the contrary, *faith* is not the condition of all moral good; he admits and mentions good works accomplished by unbelievers, for instance, the mercy of Assuerus³. Should he appear to deny this goodness⁴ in other passages, it must be taken as meaning that perfect and meritorious goodness which in the plan of God is always required of man. He had all the more reason for not making *charity* the condition of all moral goods since for Augustine this word does not always strictly signify perfect love, but often enough all good love as opposed to concupiscence.

Augustine defended the gratuity of grace, or the divine *gift*, no less than its necessity. From the year 397⁶⁷ he affirmed the absolute gratuity of the *first graces* (desire of faith, conversion), and especially in his controversy with the Semi-Pelagians; they can be the object of no merit whatever. On the contrary; the *second graces* can be merited in a certain measure by those who have faith: here, he refers to the, graces necessary for accomplishing good acts and persevering in virtue; but these are nevertheless obtained chiefly by prayer. *Final perseverance*, like the first graces, cannot be merited, but it can and should be prayed for⁷. As for *salvMion*, it is, strictly speaking, the reward merited by the *jitst mart*; but although it is a reward, it does not cease to be a grace, since *our merits* themselves are gifts of God,

¹ *Ibid.*, 484-485.

²⁴ Both these points are connected with the gratuity of grace and salvation.

³ *De grat. Christ et pece, orig.*, I, 25.

⁴ Notably in his controversy with Julian of Eclanum. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, π, p. 487-489.

⁵ For that charity by means of which all precepts are accomplished, see the fine chapters XVII-XVIII of *Degr. et lib. arbitrio*, 33-39.

⁶ Until then he had thought that the first natural movements towards good could partly merit the first graces; but he corrected his opinions in the *Ad S'i/i-pliciamini*, I, q. II; *P. L.*, 40, 111-128.

⁷ See the whole of the *De dono perseverantia*.

according to that expression so dear to Saint Augustine :
Cum Deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat quam munera sua

2. Nature of actual grace. Man redeemed "has need of a more powerful grace" than innocent man.¹⁵ With his nature, Adam received the supernatural gift of grace and a righteous will (*dederat bonam voluntatem, fecerat rectum*)³. In order to accomplish good actions he needed only an "auxilium sine quo in ea non posset permanere, si vellet": this grace, which gave him the *fosse*, was enough ; the *agere*, and consequently perseverance, remained in the power of his free-will⁴. Redeemed man, on account of his natural infirmity, has need of a more efficacious aid, which gives him: a) justice, righteousness and good will; b) the *posse*, and what is more, the *velle* (*auxilium quo*) or the very act of willing; c) lastly, perseverance which can be obtained only by means of a similar aid (*auxilium quo*)⁵. This more powerful grace, moreover, is not refused to man, who finds it superabundantly in Christ, the Incarnate Son of God,⁶ so that the saints, in spite of the many temptations to which they were exposed, remained faithful to God, whilst Adam fell in spite of all his advantages?

This grace, which affects the act of will, was often described by Saint Augustine. The classical text is that of the *De gratia et libero arbitrio* (n. 33), which shows God first preparing the will to act (*ut velimus operatur incipiens*) and then co-operating with it in the very act of willing and guiding its operation to the perfect accomplishment of the

¹ Epist. 194 (*Ad Sixium*), n. 19. P. L., 33, 880. See also *De gratia et lib. arb.*, n. 15. All this treatise insists a great deal on the gratuity of grace, as well as on man's free-will.

² See on the subject of this paragraph, *De corrept. et grat.* 3. xi-xu, 30-38.

³ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁴ Adam had need of an *auxilium quo* in order to obtain *beatitudo*, and in this respect he did not differ from redeemed man.

⁵ Modern theologians usually reduce these two conceptions, the *auxilium quo non*, and the *auxilium quo*, to the notions of sufficient and efficacious grace, which moreover they explain with certain divergences. But it would seem that Augustine's idea is not directly represented by this point of view. He was more directly concerned with showing the differences which exist between the state of innocent man and that of redeemed man, and with showing that God has measured His grace in proportion to man's needs, but increases its intensity so that man may overcome his passions. Augustine's teaching, however, may be interpreted in the above mentioned manner.

⁶ *De corrept. et grat.*, n. 30.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 33.

perfect act (*qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens*) * The *gratia operans* gives a beginning of charity (*aliquid dilectionis*)² which enables the will to receive still more by its docile correspondence to these first graces. Here the word charity indicates all supernatural love of good, even in its lowest form. In the *gratia cooperane*, this same charity, together with the action of the will, is in a sense perfect in relation to the act in question, since this act is actually produced³. There are here, therefore, two operations which are co-ordinated, or rather one of which is subordinated to the other; man indeed wills and acts, but is moved by the divine operation which penetrates his will, his heart and his free-will; all the acts he accomplishes are properly his and are rightly attributed to him, but inasmuch as they are meritorious they are properly to be attributed to God, since they derive all their supernatural goodness wholly from grace⁴.

Moreover, it should be sedulously noted that the liberty of man, far from being diminished by this co-operation, is on the contrary strengthened. Augustine never supposes that free-will gives way before the divine action. In the *De gratia et libero arbitrio* he proves this continuously from Scriptural citations;⁵ the precepts contained in Holy Writ have no meaning if man is not free⁶. Grace itself postulates rather than suppresses freewill. But it may be wondered how these assertions can be made to agree with what has gone before. Saint Augustine did not develop a system which would immediately harmonise the action of grace and that of free-will since complete harmony is to be found in those eminent principles which guide the two systems. The following are those which seem to correspond to his usual

* Et quis istam, etsi parvam, dare coeperat charitatem nisi ille qui *preparai* voluntatem, et *cooperando* perficit quod operando incipit? Quoniam ipsi *ut velimus* operatur incipiens qui volentibus cooperatur perficiens. Propter quod ait Apostolus: *tertius sum quoniam qui operatur in vobis opus bonum, perficiet usque in diem Christi Jesu* (Phil. I, 6). Ut ergo velimus, sine nobis operatur; *cum autem volumus* et sic volumus ut faciamus, nobiscum *cooperatur*: tamen sine illo, vel operante ut velimus, vel cooperante cum volumus, ad bona pietatis opera nihil valemus. *De grat. et lib. arb.*, n. 33; P. L., 44, 901.

- *Ibid.*, n. 37.

³ The distinction between preventient and subsequent grace may be approximately reduced to that. *Enchiridion*, c. xxxtt; *De nal. et grat.*, c. XXXI. See also S. THOMAS, *Sum. theol.*, I-IIæ, qu. tit, art. 2 et 3.

⁴ See what was said above with regard to the gratuity of grace.

⁵ *De grat. et lib. arb.*, n. 1-5. — ⁶ *Ibid.*, 33-37.

way of thinking: *a)* *God* Who is the Good in itself must necessarily lead his creatures to good, and all true good comes from Him;¹ *b)* the *soul*, the image of God, ordained to God as to its last end, is made for goodness to which it must naturally tend;² for this purpose, knowledge and love, the two elements of free-will, have been given to it; the more the soul frees itself from the toils of evil, the more it is free;³ *c)* the *grace of God*, far from forming an obstacle to freewill, on the contrary assists it favourably, since it helps the soul to aspire after and accomplish the good; it follows that in the measure that charity augments, even to perfect union with God, so the strength of the will grows also and consequently that of free-will.⁴

Whence comes the efficacy of grace? Saint Augustine did not study this question from such a precise angle as modern theologians. But his ideas on the subject may be gleaned from the following principles: *a)* the *will of God* is all powerful and most efficacious (*efficacissima*); *b)* that *grace* which affectively determines the adherence of the will is *gratia congrua*, adapted, that is to say, to the dispositions of the subject, as they are known to God;⁵ *c)* *free-will*, which has of itself a real power with regard to evil, is able to place obstacles in the way of grace and hinder its action, although of itself it is not able to render grace efficacious by corresponding to it.

Jansenism reduced the whole of Augustine's teaching on the efficacy of grace to the influence of some heavenly delectation which imposed itself on the will, apart from any deliberate act of volition, in order to enable man to overcome all concupiscence or earthly delectation, for man is at the mercy of both these delectations. Quod enim amplius nos delectat, secundum id operemur necesse est⁶. This teaching

¹ See above, p. 674.

² See above, p. 647. Aguntur enim (homines) ut agent, non ut ipsi nihil agent. *De corrept. et grat.*, 4.

³ Quid erit autem liberius libero arbitrio, quando non poterit servire peccato? *De corrept. et grat.*, n. 32. — ⁴ *De grat. et lib. arb.*, n. 33-34.

⁵ *Enchiridion*, c. 95 et sq. The efficacy of grace, thus considered with regard to God, is really connected with the teaching on *predestination*. See below.

⁶ See especially *Ad Siniplicianum*, I, q. it, n. 13. This congruity, which Suarez regards as being chiefly extrinsic, is looked upon by other theologians as a «congruité agissante et triomphante», that is, intrinsic. Guit.I.ERMIN, in *Renne thomiste*, 1902, p. 658.

⁷ Liberum arbitrium ad malum sufficit. *De corrept. et grat.*, n. 31.

* *In Gal.*, n. 49.

in Saint Augustine has more of a moral bearing than a strictly theological value, and this and other similar texts should be taken as implying a relative necessity. Moreover, it is not exact to say that according to Augustine all the movements of grace take the form of delectation; but even should they all be reduced to such, either desired or already possessed, this delectation, far from suppressing deliberate volition, would on the contrary provoke it, since it would induce the will to incline towards the good presented to it. Lastly, this heavenly delectation is found in but a feeble measure in those souls which have made little progress in the practice of virtue, and who, says Augustine, are the least free on account of the predominance of the passions. This delectation increases and becomes more powerful in the saints, who may be said to be truly free, with that spiritual liberty which has its foundation in a veritable *libertas a necessitate interna*, fruit of charity, and in those eminent graces which form the subject of the following section.

D) Mystical Graces.

Among the graces vouchsafed to redeemed man, Saint Augustine holds in especial esteem those which enable man to unite himself perfectly to God by acts of pure charity. Their chief effect is contemplation -, for they give a very eminent idea of God, which is spiritual, stripped of all rude imagery, and also animated, ravishing the soul with admiration and leading it to unite itself effectively to God. These graces which, while they *enlighten* the soul with regard to God, also permit Him to be *savoured*, are the graces of *intelligence* and *wisdom*. These are the graces which are especially termed the *mystical* graces. For Saint Augustine, as also for Saint Teresa, they constitute the conditions of perfect love³, or at least of the state in which this love predominates, and which Augustine always describes as being accompanied by intense graces. Saint Augustine often describes such graces, either in connection with Biblical figures, in whom he saw a representation of the contemplative life: *Rachel*,

1 According to his teaching as a whole. — 2 See the Introduction, p. 23 sq.

3 Saint Teresa stresses the power of these graces with regard to union with God. Saint Augustine prefers to insist on their power of enlightening; but of course to his mind all Christian life has charity for its end (see p. 701). In reality there are only differences of viewpoint between Augustine and Saint Teresa. See above, p. 25.

Lia's sister *Mary*, Martha's sister²⁵ and *Saint John the Evangelist*, or in his commentary of the *Beatitudes* or that of the *seven gifts of the spirit*, mentioned in *Isàias* (xi, 2), which he attributes to Christ and to the faithful ⁴.

In these latter passages, wisdom and intelligence .in- given a special place : by them, as it were, man is introduced to the state of perfection. The other gifts seem to be given only to produce these two, and themselves can only come, to perfection, in and through, the graces of intelligence and wisdom. But although they are not contemplative and mystical in the same degree, they serve a purpose in the perfecting of the soul, which they help to become wholly docile to the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

Saint Thomas followed in the traces of Augustine when he showed these graces as the consummation of the whole spiritual organisation of the soul, destined to subject the soul entirely to God s. All graces tend to this submission of the creature to the Creator⁶⁷ perfection consists in total submission, and it is that which characterises the gifts which are meant to guide the soul in the life of perfection. They are pre-eminently *operating graces*, but not in the sense of provoking only indeliberate acts. They suppose on the contrary free *co-operation*, which increases in perfection in the measure that the obstacles to grace in purified souls decrease.

From another point of view, these mystical graces are also ordinary aids. Saint Augustine never considered them as the privilege of a few chosen ones, but thought of them as being meant for all, even although in reality few souls receive them fully. That superior knowledge of God which is given by contemplative wisdom is certainly said to be a *visioni*, but it is a vision which perfects faith without destroying it, and which always remains a vision in an image, in a mirror (in speculo) ⁸, inferior to the beatific vision which

⁴ *Contra Faustum*, bk. XXII, c. 52-57.

⁵ *Senn.*, 103, 104, 169, 179, 255.

³ *De consensu Evangelistarum*, bk. I, c. 5.

^{*} *De sermone Domini*, bk. I, c. 1-4; *Deduct. Christ.*, bk. II. c. 7; „Sow“ ; 17.

⁵ *Sum. theol.*, q. 68, art. I.

⁶ See above, p. 683 sq.

⁷ See the texts indicated above.

⁸ *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. vm, 14. Saint Augustine distinguishes tin- vision in speculo (in a mirror), which is mediate, from the vision > iferula (from an observatory), which is immediate.

is immediate. *Mediate vision* which comes through the ordinary mystical grace of contemplation certainly throws light on all the objects of faith, but it does not bear directly on God, Who is the primary object, and it is thus distinguished from *extraordinary visions* which God can produce supernaturally to the eyes of the body (corporeal vision), in the imagination (imaginative vision) or in the mind alone (intellectual vision) ¹. Saint Augustine distinguishes mystical graces in the strict sense from these latter effects which are accessory² and exceptional. He also classes them apart from the *charismata*, which may sometimes exist in the absence of charity ².

The spiritual benefits especially stressed by Augustine as the effects of mystical graces are : a) spiritual *delectation*, vouchsafed to the soul which has "found" God in contemplation; b) perfect *liberty*, or the *libertas* of the innocent man, partly attained through this perfect union with Truth and Goodness; c) a greater *understanding* of the divine mysteries in general, and notably that of the Blessed Trinity ³.

III. PREDESTINATION.

Saint Augustine did not stop at considering the *order of grace* in itself; he also studied it inasmuch as it was *eternally prepared by God*, and gave to this eternal preparation the name of *predestination* in so far as it touched those *chosen* for salvation. This teaching is chiefly found in the writings of his last years ⁴; but he had already outlined its essentials ⁵ from the beginning of his episcopate. As he said himself ⁶ it was implicitly contained in that expression in the *Confessions* : *Da quod jubes et jube quod vis* ⁷.

A) Brief Summary. Difficulties.

Saint Augustine occasionally linked up predestination with God's *foreknowledge*, but in so doing he considered that foreknowledge of the *gifts* God has decided to vouchsafe to

¹ *De Gen. ad litt.* bk. XII. — ³ *Ad Simplic.* bk. II, q. I.

² See above, p. 667.

⁴ *De correpi, et grat.* ; *De predestinatione. sanctorum* ; *De dono perseverantiae* See above, p. 636.

⁵ In the *De div. qucest. ad Simpl.* bk. I.

⁶ *De dono persev.* n. 53. — ? *Confess.*, X, c. XXXVII, 60.

⁸ *Omnia itaque Dei dona... quis non dicam negare, sed dubitare saltem audeat Deum daturum se esse prescisse. De donopersev.* n. 53. See also n. 35.

men so that they may be saved, rather than the ion knowledge of merits. In reality he regards predestination as God's firm and precise will *to sanctify and save all the elect gratuitously*. He has determined their number; he knows each one individually; He has prepared infallible means to lead each one to grace; He wills that they shall accomplish the meritorious works which are the condition of gaining heaven, although they are not the condition of the divine choice; lastly, He wills to vouchsafe perseverance to them so that they may be glorified in the measure foreseen and prepared for each one of them. All the *elect*, and only they, who are the object of this predestination, will be saved, in order to manifest the merciful goodness of God. The others, who are simply *called (vocati)*² will be excluded from heaven on account of their sins, and will thus show forth (In-)justice of God.

Such a teaching is immediately faced with great difficulties. It appears to exact that the *non-elect* should be predestined to hell in the same manner and under the same conditions. Nowadays the word *predestination* is used exclusively of salvation and cannot be applied to damnation, so that no confusion can arise in these two very different cases. Saint Augustine, at a period when theological terminology had not yet been fixed, sometimes uses it in the two senses : he speaks of predestination "to eternal death", "to torment", "to eternal fire"³, etc.; usually, however, he uses this word to mean the preparation of the elect for eternal salvation. As for its *underlying idea*, which alone truly matters, it must be confessed that at first sight it seems extremely disquieting. In a great number of texts + Augustine insists on the identical situation of both the damned and the elect before the all-powerfulness of the divine will : their cause is the same; *eadem causa, causa communis*. Original sin has made of mankind a *massa perditionis*⁵. Unbaptised children are damned, admittedly by preterition, but never-

¹ See especially the *Enchiridion*, c. c, n. 26.

² The elect are "vocati secundum propositum", *De corrept. et gr.* vn, 14.

³ *De anima et ejus orig.*, IV, n. 16; *Ep.* 204, 2; *Ench.*, n. 26.

⁴ J. Tixeront (*Hist. Dogm.*, II, 509) refers to the following texts: a) *I:«. -<>..* n. 25; b) *Cont. Jul.*, IV, 45-46; c) *Ad Simplic.*, It, q. 11, especially 17; d) *Epist.*, 186, n. 12, 15, 16, 21; e) *Epist.*, 194, n. 4, 5, 23; f) *De cit. I:«.* XVI, 35; g) *Cont. 2 ep. Pelag.*, 11, 13.

⁵ Elsewhere he says *massa damnationis, ojectionis, peccati, irte, mortr*, etc. See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2397.

theless by a real act of will, independently of all foreknowledge of *personal* demerits, and in several passages adults are assimilated to them ¹. But however clear may appear these declarations it would be wrong to accept them as an exact reflection of Augustine's teaching on this subject. They only reveal one side of it; they present it from a narrow angle, which must be carefully examined if his teaching is not to be misinterpreted, and which should not be isolated from other aspects of his doctrine².

B). The Augustinian Point of View.

I. First, it must not be forgotten that in his doctrine on predestination and reprobation, Saint Augustine never loses sight of the fact, known by faith, that there exist actually two cities, and that there will be two for all eternity : the city of God, which pays homage to His infinite mercy, and the *infernal city* which manifests His justice. This fact was more or less denied by the *Origenists*, who believed in universal salvation, sometimes of the devils, but more usually of all men, or at least all Christians. Augustine opposed these exaggerations more forcefully and authoritatively than anyone else, and recalled with admirable opportuneness the data of faith ³. Nor does he ever lose sight of them, even when he rises to a higher consideration, the *eternal preparation* ⁴ of the city of the elect. This point of view takes us into the *order of intention*, that of divine wisdom, knowing and willing both the end and the means. But it must be

¹ *De dono persever.*, 25. Cf. *Conf. Jul.* iv, 42; *De corrept. et grat.*, 12. See J. Tixeront, *ffist. Dogm.*, II, 509-510.

³ Lutheran and Calvinist Protestantism is partly due to this error of perspective.

³ Here, just as when he studied the nature of man, Augustine does not take a purely *philosophical* view-point, but a real or historical point of view founded on the data of revelation. It should also be remarked that Augustine studies predestination *in concreto*, together with all the graces it supposes, from the first movement of grace until the attainment of glory (*prod. adequate sumpta*, say the theologians), and all authors agree in affirming the absolute gratuity of such predestination. As for the point on which they are divided, and which has given rise to various known systems, i. e. *predestination to glory in itself* Saint Augustine does not seem to have considered it; in reality it comes under a philosophical and speculative rather than dogmatic head; it is moreover of secondary importance compared with the other; the only really essential problem, that of *totalpredestination*, is also the only one ordinarily envisaged by Augustine.

⁴ Hæc est prædestinatio sanctorum, nihil aliud ; præscientia scilicet, et præparatio beneficiorum Dei, quibus certissime liberantur quicumque liberantur. *De dono persever.*, n. 35.

noted that in the consideration of this order, the realisation, *the fact itself, takes first place in Augustine's ideas*, He does not consider a pure intention relative to some ideal order of things, but keeps in mind the intention relative to *that* real order in which we exist and live, that intention which is *de facto* manifested by events which really take place, and which one day will be wholly revealed in heaven J. And here he is not referring merely to *foreknowledge* as such, for he also gives the divine will an important place in this preparation; but neither is it a pure order of intention, altogether independent of any contact with reality. The volition of which he treats, is that which is present to a mind dominated by *the fact* that for all eternity there will be the chosen and the damned. In short, his point of view is that of the *consequent will*, as it was called by later theologians.

In this order of the consequent will merits and demerits come into play. But Augustine does not use the expression *ante prœvisa merita*, which is used by later theologians when speaking of predestination. It would have had the disadvantage of placing the question at a different angle from his own. He was chiefly preoccupied with the gratuity of salvation, and of the very merits which lead to it, and which are divine gifts. God gives them to whom He wills, out of sheer goodness, *per misericordiam*. As for the wicked, they are *punished, but not gratuitously* or without just cause; but *per fudicium* which supposes a real guilt. Here Saint Augustine brings in original sin, which enfolds all mankind in sin, and thus explains, by the real although not always personal fault, the abandonment of those who are not saved, even children: they come under the judgment. He went too far when he affirmed that these children, on account of original sin alone, are condemned to the torment, even although it is of the lightest nature (zzzzAwzwe) ‡ but his insistence on original sin shows that reprobation, unlike predestination, is not gratuitous, and in consequence, although the situation of the elect and the damned is in some ways identical, for instance in the sense that they were both equally distant from God⁴, it is not so from every point of view. The elect are the object of infinite mercy, which God vouchsafes to whom He wills. This is no more of course than an introduction to the mystery; but it is important to note that Augustine evidently places it in the order of the consequent will.

1 See especially *Enchiridion*, n. 24, c. XCV. Here Augustine treats of predestination in the course of a study of the last ends. Such an arrangement of the treatise is very significant from the Augustinian point of view.

• See *Enchiridion*, n. 24, c. XCV.

3 This severe opinion is generally rejected now. It did not have the capital influence on his teaching as has sometimes been supposed.

4 See *Enchiridion*, n. 24 25, c. XCV-XCIX.

It is understandable in these circumstances the Doctor of Grace is chary of affirming that God desires the *salvation of all men*—he fears to affirm by this that God's power is limited¹, since, *defacto*, so many are lost². In several passages he limits or denies this will to save all men. But in others, evidently speaking of another will, which theologians have since called *antecedent will*, he unhesitatingly affirms that God wills the salvation of all men: "Vult autem Deus omnes homines salvos fieri et in agnitionem veritatis venire"⁴. Christ died for all, even for those little children who are deprived of heaven: "Et pro ipsis Christus mortuus est, qui propterea pro omnibus mortuus est quia omnes mortui sunt"⁵. These apparent contradictions disappear when it is noted that Augustine admitted, in addition to the consequent will which he treated directly, a real *antecedent* will of God, favourable to the salvation of all⁶ but too engrossed in his ordinary way of envisaging the subject he failed to stress it sufficiently. This *shortcoming* is all the more to be regretted inasmuch as he presented in extremely categorical terms the mystery of predestination, which after all is but the mystery of the relations existing between these two wills with regard to *free creatures*.

2. Another aspect of Augustinian thought as regards this present question is the existence of free-will. The latter is of itself capable of doing evil and often does so in fact; but with the help of a supernatural aid which is not refused it can also produce meritorious acts, and such aid is absolutely indispensable for fallen man, lost in the *massa perditionis*. This latter must be taken only as a strong and animated expression of the ordinary doctrine on the loss of grace through original sin, and the impossibility of the restoration of grace without supernatural intervention⁷,

¹ To appreciate this it is enough to see how he explains the text of I *Tim.*, 11, 4: *Qui omnes homines valde salvos fieri, et ad agnitionem veritatis venire*. In the *Enchiridion*, 27, he takes *omnes* as meaning that Christ is the salvation of all those who in actual fact are saved, or as meaning that there will be many saved from all classes of society. Elsewhere he translates *omnes* by *multi* (*Cont. Jul.*, IV, 44) or explains *vult* in the sense that God gives to the predestined the will to be saved (*De corr. et grot.*, 47. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.* 11, P. 565).

- *Quamvis certum sit nobis non omnes homines salvos fieri, non tamen ideo debemus omnipotentissima Dei voluntati aliquid derogare*, he declares in the *Enchiridion*, 27.

³ Saint Augustine was of the opinion that few would be saved (*Enechirid.*, n. 24, c. xcvi). But this of course could be no more than a personal conjecture, probably based on Augustine's observations on the fewness of true Christians in his time.

⁴ *De spir. et lilt.*, 58. According to the context this text of Saint Paul is here applied to those who will be judged and condemned. See also *Cont. Jul.*, vi, 8; *Cont. Jul. op. imp.*, 11, 174. — s *Cont. ful. op. imp.*, II, 175.

⁶ J. Tixeront finds these two wills indicated fairly clearly in the *Denupt. cl concup.*, II, 16, and *Cont. ful. op. imp.*, 11, 144.

⁷ See above, p. 680.

The primary purpose of this explanation is to throw into relief the divine mercy with regard to the elect. In reality the latter are singled out by a very special mercy of God, which calls them to grace, to perseverance and to glory; a choice which consists in a particular act of the Divine will, in order to lead them to salvation, to set them apart and separate them from the "mass" of those who are not. This Divine choice nevertheless affects creatures who are free and who remain so. Saint Augustine never questioned the fact of freedom, either in the chosen or the non-elect; predestination is no more derogatory to free will than is grace; on the contrary it implies it, for it consists essentially in the choice of free beings. The Augustinian system would be sadly misinterpreted were this guiding principle neglected.

3. The whole mystery of predestination is founded on this idea of liberty¹ and Augustine is well aware of it. His mind constantly finds itself faced with those problems which caused Saint Paul to cry: *Quam incomprehensibilia sunt judicia ejus et investigabiles vice ejus* [Rom., XI, 33). Augustine had a fine perception of the mystery. He made no endeavour, as did later theologians, to render it more distant or to veil it by attempting direct conciliations. Such attempts must have seemed useless or at least secondary to him, since he had found an essential solution³, clearer and more certain than the systems, for it was based on his noble and pure idea of God⁴. For Augustine, as has been said, God is, before all, *Truth, Wisdom and Goodness*. Surely a Being can in no way be the cause of evil; but together with just reasons for permitting it, He has the means to foresee it, the power to punish it, and the wisdom to draw good from it in a certain measure by making it show forth His justice, just as the reward of the good works of the elect manifests His mercy. It should be noted that Augustine

¹ As has been seen, it has also the advantage of explaining the "judicium" which affects the damned.

³ If for Augustine there is no free-will, if all is reduced to a crude determinism willed by God, there would be no mystery and it would be difficult to understand why he so constantly refers and appeals to it.

³ This solution is termed *essential*, since it bears both on the fundamental points of the doctrine of predestination (see above, p. 690, note 3) and because it has influenced all theologians and theological systems; all secondary solutions, are worthless unless they are in harmony with the latter or at least suppose it.

⁴ See above, p. 674.

always explains that justice and mercy by which God is guided, as it were, in His relations with His creatures, by the fundamental attributes of the Divinity, Truth, Goodness and Wisdom,* without which there would be no God. To Augustine's mind such is the essential and perhaps only solution of the problem. It is no doubt an indirect and oblique solution, but it is nevertheless radical, and probably the only efficacious approach to this redoubtable mystery, which envisaged in this manner loses many of its thorns. It is moreover a *true* solution based on intellectual principles and not a merely sentimental accommodation³.

C) Advantages and Disadvantages.

Considered from the Augustinian view-point, the doctrine of predestination is not so terrifying as has sometimes been affirmed. In spite of certain shortcomings that we have pointed out, it possesses great advantages in the realms of *apologetics, theology and mysticism*, a) It maintains, against Origenism, the fact that there will be both the elect and the damned, and against Pelagianism the *gratuity of grace and salvation*, b) It stresses the *special affection and mercy* with which God favours the elect, c) It throws the *Divine perfections* into sharp relief; it causes the mind to bow before an impenetrable wisdom; it forces the will to abandon itself with confidence to the Infinite Will; the heart is touched at the sight of God's eternal care for His faithful creatures. This mystery is indeed one of those that most nourishes the piety of certain souls. Saint Augustine, as a true mystic, delighted in its meditation. All these motives led him, not to create a new doctrinal system as some have insisted, but rather to treat to a greater extent of that superior aspect of the traditional doctrine of grace which is the doctrine of predestination.

* It should also be noted that Augustine appeals to the divine wisdom rather than *knowledge*.

³ It is a solution which in no way begs the question, for the divine wisdom, can be proved by demonstrative arguments and there is no need of recourse to a laboriously elaborated system on the mysterious agreement of free-will and predestination. It is rather the divine wisdom, demonstrated with certainty, which should help to resolve the — secondary — problem raised by the "how" of this agreement.

³ But it is of course evident that an ardent affection for God gives a greater understanding of the divine attributes and shows even more clearly the value of the above solution.

This tendency, although perfectly legitimate in itself, might have presented certain dangers. There was the risk of forgetting that God acts in the soul only that the soul may act, that predestination, far from excluding human activity, normally exacts and invites it. Saint Augustine's mysticism was counterbalanced by his moralism. This is especially evident in the manner in which he desired this doctrine to be preached. The faithful should not be told: "Whether you run, whether you sleep, you are what lie. Who cannot be deceived has foreseen"; but rather: "Run that you may obtain (i Cor., IX, 24) and know that by the *very fact of your running* you have been predestined to run successfully"¹. But whatever precautions are taken it is true that this doctrine remains difficult to understand and can easily become disquieting. To bear good fruit it should be meditated only by those calm souls, strengthened by piety and having serene confidence in God and His attributes; others may easily go astray. It is the corner stone rather than the foundation of the spiritual edifice, and great prudence is necessary if the whole Christian life is to be based upon it. Luther and Calvin made the mistake of disfiguring this doctrine, and made their error worse by widely disseminating it without any precaution or reservation. It is true enough that their conception of predestination was well fitted to their fundamental teaching of *faith without works*; but by that they receded still farther from Saint Augustine, whom they pretended was their master. In spite of retaining some of his expressions, they betrayed him by overthrowing the whole hierarchy of spiritual values he had established. Protestantism is no more than pseudo-Augustinism.

IV. MORAL AND ASCETIC TEACHING.

A). The Moralism of Saint Augustine.

Whatever may be the importance of speculation in Augustine's works, in spite of the place he gives to grace and predestination, notwithstanding his exuberant mysticism, or

¹ See the *introduction*, p. 30.

² *De dono person.*, n. 57; *P.* 45, 1028. Saint Augustine was of the opinion that the doctrine of predestination could be preached to the faithful with great fruit, and gives useful hints on the subject in the last chapters of this work.

rather on account of the way he envisages the latter, his teaching was frankly and outstandingly moral. And this has been universally recognised by tradition, which gives to him the title of Doctor of Charity and especially asks guidance of him in the spiritual life. This aspect of his teaching is so important that a neglect of it is liable to entail a travesty of his whole doctrine.

Not only does Saint Augustine maintain free-will by the side of grace, but he also insistently recalls the necessity of voluntary moral activity. Like Saint Jerome refuting Jovianus », he combats the theory, of justification by faith without works², already formulated ten centuries before the coming of Luther. He explains the text of the Epistle to the Romans (in, 28) : “ *Arbitramur justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis* ”, by that of the Epistle to the Galatians (V, 6) : “ *Fides quæ per dilectionem operatur* ” and he concludes “ That is the faith that distinguishes the faithful from impure demons; for the latter, says the Apostle James, *fear and tremble* (il, 19) but their faith acts not. They have not the faith of which the just man lives, that which works through charity, so that God gives him eternal life *according to his works*”. Moreover, so dear to him is this doctrine and so much in harmony with what has just been cited that he adds : “ But since our good works themselves are from God, Who gives us both faith and charity, the Doctor of the Gentiles himself calls *grace* this eternal life ”³. Saint Augustine forcefully maintains this teaching on spiritual activity both against those slothful monks who wished to content themselves with prayer to the exclusion of work », and against the Semi-Pelagians who declared that man is not to be blamed for his falls, since grace itself is responsible⁵. He affirms it in the very way he desires predestination to be preached⁶ It makes him give a practical bearing to his most speculative works⁷.

But although the Augustinian teaching on grace, far from presenting an obstacle to voluntary action and works, on the contrary furthers them, it certainly gives them a *special character*. Augustine's ideal was the perfect Christian,

¹ See above, p. 577. — ² *De Gratia et lib. arb.*, vn, n. 18.

³ *Ibid.* — ⁴ See *De opere monachal nm*, about 400.

⁵ See *De correptione et gratia* in 427. See above, p. 636.

⁶ See *De dono pcrsev.t* xxii-xxm, n. 57-65. See above, p. 695.

⁷ See above, p. 651.

unreservedly docile to the guidance of the Holy Ghost. The first condition of this *docility* to grace is *faith*, not any kind of faith, but supernatural faith accompanied by *humility* (God is the true source of all good accomplished by man), by *confidence* (required for that prayer through which grace is obtained), by at least a practical *understanding* of God, to obtain guidance in *conduct*, and lastly by *purity of heart*, without which this knowledge of God is impossible. By such dispositions man becomes truly fit to *receive* divine inspirations with profit. Such are the essentials of what may be called Augustinian "passivity".

But it must not be forgotten that this very passivity is a source of action; it is an *active passivity*, if it may be so expressed; faith renders man submissive to God so that he may act through *charity*. This activity is primarily *interior* and affective; it consists in *supernatural love* or the active exercise of charity. Sometimes, when grace is stronger, or the soul better disposed, this love seems to spring directly and effortlessly from its source, and breaks out in cries of praise, admiration and thanksgiving², as may be seen in so many pages of Saint Augustine. At other times this activity is very weak, even laborious, when love is still seeking its object and has not discovered it sufficiently to rest therein, and to possess it in joy; but it is nevertheless real, for it is produced by charity, or the beginning of charity and although the guidance of the Holy Ghost is not yet perfect, it has begun, in proportion as the soul corresponds to grace, and in spite of opposition. Moreover, this interior activity finds its complement in good works, whatever they may be³. They are its necessary consequence; they bear witness to the reality of the guidance of the Holy Ghost⁴; the more the latter is rendered effective by the docility

* *Passivity* thus signifies the aptitude to receive (*pati*), rather than *inaction* as it is sometimes understood.

² Certain authors term this perfect and supernatural activity of love "passive love", i. e., the love "received" from the Holy Ghost.

³ Suited to the state of each one, either charitable or zealous works, or ascetic exercises, or even the intellectual activity of the theologian engaged in studying the mysteries.

⁴ Saint Augustine would certainly have concurred with Saint Teresa, who declared with regard to souls which have attained the highest degree of docility to the Holy Ghost under the influence of the most eminent passive or mystical graces: "Works: there, I repeat, is the true mark of the operation of God and of the gift of His Hand". *hit. Castle, vnth Mans.*, ch. IV.

of the soul, the greater is the variety and fruitfulness of good works.

Such seems to be the firm and logical link binding the doctrine of *grace to Augustinian moral teaching*. The latter, as is evident, was regarded by Saint Augustine from an extremely active and ascetic point of view. Before treating it more in detail from this angle we will examine the essential elements which compose it, without reference to the actual state of souls tending to perfection.

B). Fundamental Elements of Augustinian Moral Teaching.

1). The quest for happiness constitutes for man a natural necessity. He is unable to evade it. It is at the root of all his activity'. But, on the other hand, *God alone* can be man's happiness². Since man is nobler than any other created thing he can be satisfied with none; nor, since he is imperfect, can he find satisfaction in himself. He finds rest only in subsisting Goodness, Being and Truth. This possession of God, Who is a wholly spiritual Being, must be both an act of the mind and an act of love. Man must therefore seek God to enjoy (*frui*) Him, and creatures to use them (*uti*) in his progress towards God³. To seek them for themselves is foolishness and degradation, for such is contrary to natural order.

2). *God commanded* man to respect the order of nature and to seek his true happiness. Hence the law⁴ which thus supposes, in addition to a natural order, conformable to the divine reason, a divine will that imposes it. This constitutes for free-will the source of moral obligation. Hence to seek creatures for themselves is more than foolishness, it is disobedience and sin. The good which is simply counselled is not obligatory under pain of sin.

3). Sin is therefore a violation of the order willed by God. Saint Augustine was the first to establish clearly a fundam-

¹ "The Augustinian conception of morality is therefore frankly *eudemonistic*; happiness is conceived as being man's end in life, precisely because the soul seeks it with an irresistible impulse. Here we have that optimism which is essential to any logical spirituality". E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, col. 2433. See above, p. 664.

² See chiefly the *De moribus*, bk. I, c. VIII, 13; XI, 18 sq. *De Trinitate*, bk. XI, c. v-ix. *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XIX. *Sermon iy*>. — ³ See especially *De doct. Christ.*, I, c. IVsq. — ⁴ A summary of St. Augustine's teaching on the *moral Order and the law*, eternal law, natural law, temporal law and the law of grace,' may be found in B. ROLAND-GOSSELIN, *op. cit.*, p. 21-71.

ental distinction between mortal and venial sins, based on principles which were admitted by all later theologians. *Mortal sins* (*letalia, mortifera, gravia*) are those which deprive the sinner of heaven, and can be remitted only by the Church; *venial sins* (*levia, venialia*) are those which do not destroy righteousness and may be remitted by good works, without the intervention of the Church¹.

4). Virtue, on the other hand, consists in the love of truth, of the good which is commanded² and also the love of the good which is simply counselled; in short, the love of all forms of *moral good*. Saint Augustine often treats it from this general aspect. He also delights in considering it as a force that *heals* the soul of its inherent weaknesses, which are so opposed to the love of good, or which *purifies* the eye of the heart which is destined to see God.

5). Under the heads of prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance come all the moral virtues³. This classification, which was formulated by the early philosophers, is maintained and often used by Augustine, who moreover also admitted the existence of natural virtues, even in the Pagans⁴. Among the especial virtues on which Augustine particularly insists should be mentioned sincerity, which leads him to consider all lying⁵ and duplicity⁷ as intrinsically bad. He has also been mistakenly accused of denying the right

* *Enchiridion*, c. LXIV-LXX. Sermon 352, n. 7-9. *De symb. nd cat.*, 15. *Defide et operib.*, 48.

a Virtus est ordo amoris, *De Civ. Dei*, XV, c. 22.

3 See *Solii.*, I, η. 13 sq.

♦ See *De moribus*, I, η. 25 and 35'45. & *De Civ. Dei*, XIX, c. tv. />, η *contra Man.*, II, c. X, 13-14 (the four rivers of Eden). Sermon 150, 9. In *Psalm.* 83, n. it. *De quest.*, LXXXiv, q. 31.

s He quotes the mercy of Assuerus (*De gratia Ch. et pece, orig.*, l. <s>). ll> temperance of Polemon (*Ep.* 144, 2), and speaks of the Pagans in general in *De spiritu et Utt.*, 48. See other texts quoted by E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, 2436. Elsewhere, it is true, and chiefly in his writings against Julian, he terms these good works sins. "But not", says Tixeront, "as if these acts were always bad in themselves and in their object; they become so through lack of a right intention, because their authors linger and delight in the act itself, and, being without faith, fail to ordain their acts to the end to which they should relate them". *Hist. Dogm.*, it, p. 488. See *ibid.*, p. 487-489. Saint Augustine does not speak as a philosopher, but as a believer who knows that God has ordained man to a supernatural end, and therefore judges that all acts which are not related to this end are imperfect and relatively evil.

6 See above, p. 652. See also *Enchiridion*, c. xvii-xxt.

1 See his correspondence with Saint Jerome on the subject of the incident at Antioch.

of property on account of certain expressions, which, however, should not be taken from a juridical but from a moral and mystical point of view 1. This general preoccupation explains why Augustine — and as a rule the other Fathers also — had a tendency to severity² which is not found in modern moralists, who are more given to casuistry than were the Fathers.

6) Yet in spite of their importance the moral virtues cannot lead the soul to its last end in the absence of the theological virtues, without which the others are not even true virtues'. In the *Enchiridion* he insists especially on *faiths* which is moreover the necessary basis of all supernatural and Christian life. He shows that *hope* is the condition of all faith, working through charity 4, and the source of true joy, since the sweetness of God is revealed to those who hope 5. But it is *charity* which truly unites man to God. Saint Augustine gives it exceptional importance in his teaching, for he often applies the name of charity in a wide sense to that love of good which is implied by every virtue 6.7 In a stricter sense, charity is not the only virtue, but it is the queen of virtues; all other virtues should lead to charity, and through charity they should achieve their final purpose, that is to say, the union of the soul with God. Charity is the only precept of the Scriptures 7. A typically Augustinian definition of charity is that found in the *De doctrina Christiana*: "Motus animi ad fruendum Deo propter ipsum, et se atque proximo propter Deum" 8.

¹ See B. Roland Gosselin, *op. cit.*, p. 168-218.

² In their case the terms *tutorism* and *probabiliorism* can scarcely be used, since these expressions correspond to view-points they never envisaged. Nevertheless, in Saint Augustine's works may be found a number of practical solutions which show that in the case of theoretical doubt he allowed liberty in practice (*Ep. ctf.* 4). J. DE Blic, *Probabilisme*, in *Diet. Apol.*, col. 305, quotes other texts.

³ Non enim aliter poterunt veræ esse virtutes. *De Trinit.*, XIII, n. 2(5). They are deprived of all meritorious value, contrary to the will of God. In this sense Augustine is right. It would be a manifest exaggeration if he refused all moral goodness to natural works, but this does not seem to be his meaning. See above, p. 681, 699.

⁴ *Sermon*, 158, 8.

⁵ *Sermon*, 145, 2.

⁶ Baius and the Jansenists were therefore in error when they affirmed that he taught that with the exception of supernatural and Christian love all affections of the soul were evil.

⁷ Non praecepit Scriptura nisi caritatem; *De doct. Christ.*, III, c. X, 15.

⁸ *De doct. Christ.*, III, c. X, 16. See *ibid.*, I, c. iv, xxn, xxxiu.

7) Christian perfection, therefore, resides in charity, in that charity which accomplishes the law and sums up every virtue²⁵ in itself, in that charity which is the source of pure love (*castus amor*), which makes God³ loved for Himself⁴ because of His perfections. Such charity cannot be⁵ in this world in the measure that would maintain the soul in the perfect life without the aid of the mystical graces which derive from contemplative wisdom⁵.

C) Augustinian Ascetic Teaching.

This strong, pure and fruitful charity is only obtained after a long preparation, in the course of which the soul is purified by the practice of the virtues. Morality considered from this somewhat subjective point of view, as treating of the elements which are best calculated to lead the soul gradually to perfection, is called *Ascetic Theology*⁶.

Saint Augustine gave various classifications of the stages of spiritual life as it advances towards perfection or wisdom. In *die De quantitate animæ* he distinguishes four degrees of moral activity to which he gave the following names: 1) *virtus*; 2) *tranquillitas*; 3) *ingressio* (in lucem), 4) *mansio* (in luce). Later, he formulated a fresh division according to the gifts of the Holy Ghost⁸ but in reality this differs but little from the foregoing. *Fear* represents the first stage of the spiritual life; *wisdom* is its consummation; between these two extremes he clearly distinguishes a double period of *purificatory preparation*: first a remote preparation by means of the active exercise of the *moral virtues*, which corresponds to the gifts of piety, fortitude, knowledge and counsel; followed by an immediate preparation by which the soul is purified, thanks to a more enlightened faith giving rise to a firmer *hope* and a more ardent *charity*. Whilst the first preparation is called *active* life, the second is called *contemplative* life⁹, since in the latter moral activity is wholly subordinated to faith, made luminous by contemplation, whilst

¹ Charitas perfecta, perfecta justitia est; *De nat. et grat.*, c. LXX, 84.

³ Dilige et quod vis fac; *In Joann.*, vu, 8 (The usual form of this expression, which has now become proverbial, is: *Ama eum quod vis*).

⁷ Quietism cannot claim to be based on Augustine's teaching.

⁴ This excludes Bolgeni's error, who in opposition to Quietism excluded benevolence from perfect love. See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, 2435-2438.

⁵ See above, p. 686-687.

⁶ See the *Introduction*, p. 20.

⁷ *De quant. anima*, c. XXXIII, n. 70-76.

⁸ See above, p. 686.

⁹ According to *De doct. christ.* (II, c. 7) and similar passages, the division into stages marked by these gifts should not be taken too strictly, except perhaps for piety, which is immediately connected with fear.

¹⁰ See the texts mentioned above, p. 687, regarding Lia and Rachel, Martha and Mary, or the evangelists. See especially the *De Trinil.*, bk. XII-XIV.

thus begins, and which, for those souls who are fully at peace and docile to grace, will one day end in perfect wisdom *.

The Christian who desires to tend to perfection must first overcome the obstacles which his rebellious passions place in his way. Man is instantly delivered from sin by baptism, but the wounds left by sin are only gradually healed'. Three in particular make themselves felt: these are the three *concupiscences* mentioned by Saint John (Z *Joan.*, II, 16): the concupiscence of the flesh, the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life¹. Saint Augustine often reduces these to a single form: *cupidity*, or self love⁴, which is opposed to charity and which is the guiding principle of the terrestrial city which strives against the City of God⁵. As regards the *effects* they produce in man, he particularly indicates: a) the privation of the vision of God, which is reserved only to the pure of heart who are not blinded by earthly things⁶; b) the meretricious and artificial character of the pleasures they give to the spiritual soul, which was created for the eternal joys of truth'; c) lastly, the degradation of the image of God, which in the sinner is gradually replaced by the image of the beast (*imago pecudis*)

Augustinian asceticism is dominated by this latter point of view and aims at the restoration of the image of God in the soul'. This interior renewal, which begins with sanctifying *grace*, is consummated by perfect *faith, hope* and *charity*. But these virtues can only achieve their purpose if they are aided by the various means of sanctification of which man disposes.

The general means on which Saint Augustine insist are :

a) actual *grace*, in the absence of which nothing can be accomplished in the supernatural order ;

↳ the *moral virtues*; first, temperance, which is the first to develop¹ (corresponding to fear in the order of the degrees of the spiritual life); the fortitude, justice and prudence²; all human activity is guided by these virtues; but certain acts which they elicit are peculiarly apt to help the progress of the soul ;

c) the *spiritual combat*' against the devil, the passions, and temptations in general : robust faith is an aid to mortification ;

d) *good works*, especially works of mercy * ;

¹ St. Augustine does not seem to have given the classical division of the three ways, purgative, illuminative, unitive; but these can easily be seen in his doctrine. See above, p. 22. — ' *De Trinit.*, bk. XIV, c. xvn.

³ *De Trinit.*, bk. XII, c. 1.x, 14. See also *De vera relig.*, c. XXXVIII-LII.

⁴ *De doct. Christ.*, bk. III, c. X, 15-16. See J. Mausbach, *op. cit.*, I, p. 222 sq. — ⁵ See above, p. 648.

⁶ *De doct. Christ.*, bk. I, c. X-XIV, 10-13.

¹ *Confess.*, bk. I, c. I, I.

² *De Trinit.*, bk. XII, c. XI, 16.

³ *De Trinit.*, bk. XIV, c. XV, XVI, XVII. *De spiritu et Utt.*, c. XXII-XXIII, 37-38; and chiefly c. XXVIII, 48-49.

¹⁰ See above, p. 681.

¹¹ See *De moribus*, bk. I, c. XIX, 35.

¹² These correspond to the active and remote preparation to wisdom.

¹³ See the *De agone Christiano*.

¹⁴ *Enchiridion*, c. LXXII sq.

e) *prayer* in general, absolutely necessary to obtain grace¹;

f) *piety*, which is a form of prayer, is especially recommended, chiefly piety towards Jesus Christ, Incarnate Wisdom².

The special means of sanctification the most recommended by Saint Augustine are the religious state and the study of the Scriptures.

1. The *religious state*, which supposes celibacy, he considers particularly useful, but he does not go as far as denying the sanctity of marriage. The religious organisation³ he himself propagated comprises : a) life in community; b) vows; c) obedience; d) poverty; in addition, the virtues he chiefly looks for in the monk are: a) charity⁴; b) humility⁵; c) work, even manual work⁶. The religious life is more favourable than any other state to the realisation of the contemplative life.

2. The *study of the Scriptures*, carried out from the spiritual point of view of which we treat at present, contributes effectively both to the strengthening of moral life by teaching the necessity and the practice of virtue, and to the deepening of the contemplative life by revealing God and His perfections.

The purpose, but not the end⁷, of the ascetic ascension, is a state of (relative) perfection, which is characterised, according to the point of view adopted, by *charity*, by *wisdom* (both the gift and perfect righteousness which it should produce), or by *perfect union with God* (total spiritual renewal or the restoration of the image of God makes the transformed soul one spirit with Him)⁸. Saint Augustine also calls it *contemplative life*, on account of the predominance in this state of a true supernatural spirit deriving from contemplation, and which is able to produce, and must have, an effect on exterior activity, especially apostolic works which occasionally fall even to the monks themselves⁹.

V. THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS.

A). The Church.

Augustine, says Mgr Batiffol, nourished a tender devotion for the *Church*. He merited the title of Doctor of the Church as well as *Doctor of Grace*. All the essential points of Ecclesiology were treated by him.

i) He magnificently expressed, especially in his sermons, the mystical bonds which unite the Church to *God* and to *Christ* (*Pater Deus est, mater Ecclesia; Sponsa Christi*;

¹ See especially *De Sermonibus Domini*, bk. II, c. III-XI; *Epist.*, 130, to Proba, c. vn-xv; *Senn.* 56, 57, 58, 59 and also 42. All these texts explain the *Dater*. See. J. Martin, *La doctrine spirituelle*, p. 171-192. — ² See above, p. 696.

³ *Semi.*, 355-356, *Epist.* 211 (Rule) and *Epist.* 150.

⁴ *Epist.* 211. See the *Tractatus in IJoann.* See also above, p. 661.

⁵ See the treatise *De sancta virginitate*.

⁶ See the *De opere monachorum*.

⁷ *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. VII.

⁸ The description and limit of perfection: *De spiritu et littera*, c. xxxvi, 64-66. — ⁹ *Contra Faustum*, bk. XXII, c. LIV. *De civ. Dei*, bk. XIX, c. xtx.

Corpus Christi;...), or its mission to men (*mater spiritualis, societas sacramentorum, regnum calorum*)'. He regarded these various titles and the doctrine they imply as so important that Mgr Batiffol, in the conclusion of his splendid work, rejoices at being able to restore to Augustine the glory "of having made of Catholicism not only a reasoned faith, not only a unity, but also something *mystical*. More than any other Doctor he possessed a loving intuition of the presence and action of God in the Church "a.

2). By insisting on this mystical aspect of the Church, Augustine supposes, rather than excludes, ecclesiastical social organisation. The body of Christ supposes a diversity of members and of functions. The Protestant thesis of a universal priesthood and an equality of powers in the faithful is quite opposed to Augustine's ideas: the outstanding place he gives to the sacrament of Order is sufficient proof of this³. He does not use the word *hierarchy*, but its equivalent is found in *ordo clericorum*; the body of Christians who have received the "ordinationis sacramentum". To them alone is transmitted the power to continue the work of Christ, by preaching, by the government of the faithful, by the forgiveness of sins and by administration of the sacraments. They represent the true Church of Christ in which alone it is possible to find salvation.

3). Saint Augustine also explained the four notes of the true Church, especially in his controversy with the Donatists. But he insisted more especially on holiness and Catholicity: a) The Church is *Holy*; but in this world it is also a mixed society, comprising the just and the sinner, mingling outwardly but spiritually separated by their works; the final separation will take place at the end of the world i. The real holiness of a great number of the members of the Church is described at length in the *De moribus* 5, and is regarded by Augustine as a powerful apologetica! argument. S) *Catholicity* should not be separated from *unity*⁶, and Augustine compares it with the narrow provincialism of the

¹ See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2408. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, n. 2 1-276.
² *ibid.*, p. 548.

³ See below, p. 708 sq. The Protestants, Loots and Harnack for instance, also admit this. — ⁴ See chiefly the *Contra Ep. Parmen.*, above, p. 626.

⁵ *De moribus Eccl. Calc.*, I, c. XXX-XXXIII.

⁶ Unity and Catholicity, like apostolicity, are closely linked up with the authority of the Roman Church, the *Apostolic See*.

African Donatisti. It should also be noted that in his controversy with the schismatics Augustine adopted Saint Cyprian's maxim : *Outside the Church, no salvation*

4). Augustine recognised that the magisterium of the Church possessed an *infallible* authority a, and assigned to it the following essential organs : a) *universal councils*, whose decisions are irrevocable (unlike particular or provincial councils and plenary or regional councils) 3, although Portalié thinks that Augustine considers that their decisions in disciplinary matters may sometimes be modified 4; b) *the Bishops of Rome*, whose authority is manifested by the conduct and doctrine of Augustine himself, especially in the Pelagian controversy 5. Saint Augustine is the best of the early witnesses to the *doctrinal authority* of Rome, as well as to her universal primacy and jurisdiction.

5). The centre of the Church is found at Rome.

a) Rome is pre-eminently the Apostolic See, for in Rome is the Chair of Peter (*Cathedra Petri*). Augustine exalts the privileges of Peter, *in quo primatus apostolorum tam excellenti gratia præreminet* yet he does not separate them from those of the Roman episcopacy, to which they are transmitted; the primacy of the Apostolic See has always dwelt therein, *in qua semper apostolica cathedra viguit principatus*". The true Apostolicity of any Church is guaranteed by union with this See. And Saint Augustine, like Saint Irenæus, establishes the Apostolicity of the Roman See by invoking the uninterrupted succession of its Bishops 8. The See of Peter is also the centre of the Universal or Catholic Church'. b) The doctrinal authority of this Church is such that its ruling on any question is definitive; its decisions are equivalent to those of the whole Church and there is no appeal from the former to the latter ". It has not been proved that in this case

1 *Salus extra Ecclesiam non est. De bapt.*, IV, c. XVII, 24. Augustine did not say: *Extra Ecclesiam nulla gratia conceditur* (the condemned 29th proposition of Quesnel). His wide conception of the City of God supposes the doctrine of the soul of the Church, which, however, he did not make explicit. The need of combating the Donatista forced him to insist on the obligation incumbent on all, of not remaining deliberately outside the visible Church on pain of damnation.

2 See above, p. 660 669.

3 But see, as regards this distinction, J. Tixeront. *Hist. Dogm.*, it, p. 391.

4 *Op. cit.*, col. 2414. In this sense the author takes a greatly discussed phrase of the *De baptismo* (bk. II, c. III, 4): " Ipsaque plenaria (concilia) sæpe priora posterioribus emendari ", But this could only be the case with regional councils. Other authors find Augustine less explicit.

5 E. Portat.iii. *op. cit.*, col. 2415. See above, p. 631.

6 *De baptismo*, bk. II, c. 1.2. — ' *Epist.* 43, c. VII, 7.

8 *Cont. epist. fund.*, c. IV, 5.

' See F. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, 208-209.

4 /*ibid.*, 402-410.

Augustine supposed the Roman Church to be present in Council. On the other hand he does not explicitly state that this authority is invested in the person of Saint Peter's successor; but there is no doubt that this is what he held. ¶ The power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, which Augustine accorded to Rome, is particularly seen with regard to the appeals made to that See. Augustine himself was involved in the affair of Antoninus of Fussala'. He was less so in the affair of Apiarius'; but, apart from the question of the latter's guilt, even had he rejected the right of the lesser clergy to appeal to Rome, it would have been merely a measure of expediency, for he recognised the bishops' right to appeal. It is scarcely probable that Augustine took part in the Council of Carthage 426, which after Apiarius' avowals sent remonstrances to Pope Saint Celestine.

6). The Church and the State

In the *City of God* the terms "terrestrial city", "Heavenly city", are ordinarily opposed since Augustine was directly envisaging contrary principles. Sometimes, however, they possess a more concrete significance, and mean, respectively, the *State*, which deals with the administration of temporal things, and the *Church*, which busies itself with spiritual interests. Here the two cities are far from being in opposition; the State was willed by Providence; the Christian owes it obedience in temporal things; but the State itself is based on justice, of which the Church is the keeper. Moreover, the State must help and protect the Church. Saint Augustine's ideas on this exceptionally important matter may be reduced to the following :

λ) *The Church has the right to State protection*, but heresies and false worship have no right to this privilege; they may in some instances even be subjected to coercion'.

ζ) *Practical tolerance of non-Catholic worship* is right and good, and was instinctively practised by Augustine when he became bishop; In- trusted the force of truth more than Caesar's help for the spreading of Christ's reign". But there is a limit set to this tolerance; attacks on

' See above, p. 519, note It. — ' *Ibid.*

3 In spite of the contrary opinion of Tileniont and the Gallicans, who regarded the letter of the Council in 426 as a "shattering" letter against the appeals. See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 470 sq.

* See P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, 336-348. J. Martin, *La doctrine sociale de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1912.

5 Prorsus divina providentia regna constituuntur humana. *De civ. Dei*, bk. V, c. 1; bk. XV, c. iv; bk. XVIII, c. II, I. — 6 *Expos. propos. ex Ep. ad Rom.*, pr. 72.

7 Remota igitur iustitia quid sunt regna, nisi magna latrocinia? *De civ. Dei*, bk. IV, c. iv. See bk. V, c. XXIV; bk. XIX, c. XXI, 2; *Ep.* 105.

8 See the interesting study by G. Combès, *La doctrine politique de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1927.

9 Saint Augustine was acquainted with Theodosius' laws against the heretics, and never thought them unjust, although at first he was not inclined to apply them.

" *Pro pace laudabiliter tolerant, non ea laudabilia sed damnable iudicantes, Contra Cresc.*, III, 55. This was said of evil in general, which must be supported by the just. But as Batiffol remarks, "It is a remarkable formula, which might well serve as a definition of tolerance". *Op. cit.*, p. 291.

social and religious peace and order justify the abandonment of toleration, and recourse to force

c) The *intervention of the State* in religious matters should never be carried as far as the infliction of the death penalty, at least in the case of Christians*. The State should first endeavour to prepare a basis of mutual understanding and clear away obstacles to the spreading of truth. In case of necessity the State may have recourse to veritable coercive measures, which are then not only lawful but also extremely efficacious*.

B) The Sacraments s.

The sacraments constitute the great wealth of the Church whose charge is the continuation of Christ's work and the dispensation of His treasures. Saint Augustine regards this link between the *sacraments* and the *Church* as fundamental. It enables us to appreciate more precisely the exact meaning of this word in his works and the nature of his teaching. Although a complete methodical sacramentary teaching was not fully developed until the Middle Ages, its beginnings may be found in the principles laid down by Augustine, which served as a guide to later theologians in this matter.

i. General notion of the Sacraments. The sacraments are before all the *signs* of holy things⁶⁷ Saint Augustine's mysticism gave him a love for symbols. He found many figures of Christ in the *Old Testament*, and gave to them the name of sacraments⁷. But he carefully distinguished these from the sacraments of the *New Law*, which are "virtute maiora, utilitate meliora, actu facilia, numero pauciora"⁸. Only these latter deserve the name of sacra

¹ See above, his attitude towards Donatism. He never asked that the Jews, Manichaeans or other heretics should be coerced into conversion, says P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 229. See, however, P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 332, note.

³ Nullis tamen bonis in Catholica hoc placet, si usque ad mortem in quemquam licet hæreticum sæviatur. *Contra Cresc.*, III, 55. But on the other hand he admitted the interdiction of Paganism under pain of death. *Cont. Ep. Farm.*, I, 15.

³ P. Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

⁴ On the one hand the liberty to err is the worst death of the soul: "quæ enim pejor mors animæ, quam libertas erroris?" *Epist.* 105, 10. On the other hand, coercion, far from making hypocrites, often leads to useful reflection and a sincere return to truth: "Foris inveniatur necessitas, nascitur intus voluntas *Semi.* 112, 8.

⁵ See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2416 sq. P. Pourrat, *La théologie sacramentaire*, chiefly p. 123-141. J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 396-429.

⁶ Sacramentum, id est, sacrum signum. *De civ. Dei*, X, 5. See *Epist.* 138, 7.

⁷ *Contra Faustum*, bk. XIX, c. Xltisq. *Contra Iul. Petii.*, bk. II, c. xxxvii, 87.

⁸ *Contra Faustum*, bk. XIX, c. XIII.

merits in a strict sense. They form a social bond among the faithful and moreover unite them to Christ, whose instruments they are. Augustine conceives them as follows.

A sacrament, the sign of a holy thing, comprises two elements : «) the holy thing that is signified, *res*, and which, at least for the sacraments of the New Testament, is called *gratia*, or *virtus* (sacramenti) «; the sign of this sacred reality, or *sacramentum*, which is visible or tangible, and which includes an outward rite accompanied by words; the rite supposes in the elements which are used a certain natural aptitude to signify the reality of which they are the sign, and also a special divine institution and particular consecration which is manifested by the accompanying words. These words may constitute what later theology has called the form of the sacrament; such is the case in this rarely quoted text on the Eucharist : “Tolle ergo verbum, panis est et vinum; adde verbum et fiet sacramentum”³. In other cases they may be no more than formulas meant for the preparation of the matter⁴, rather than those by which the rite is applied to the believer.

What is the nature of the bond which unites the sign to the sacred thing in the sacraments of the New Law? This bond is more than a symbol; the sign is not an empty sign; it possesses a real *efficacy*, of which Augustine treats chiefly with regard to the sacraments of Baptism and Order.

2. Baptism and Order. The Donatist controversy led the Bishop of Hippo to formulate an exact teaching on the efficacy of these two sacraments⁵. He established the great distinction between their *validity* and their *efficacy* properly so called, that is, the production of grace. Saint Cyprian had made both depend on the faith of the minister; the Donatists

¹ *Epist.* 54, I.

² *De catechiz.*, 50. *In Joann.*, tract. XXVI, 11.

³ *Inedited Senn*, vi, 3. *P. L.*, 46, 836. On this text see P. Batiffol, note, in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1916, p. 538-541.

⁴ Such, according to J. Tixeront, seems to be the meaning of the well known text on baptism : “Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum” (*In Joann.*, tract. IXXX, 3). No doubt *sacramentum* may signify baptism in the proper sense of the word; but it may also mean no more than the water sanctified for the purpose of baptism (this sense it found in St. Ambrose; see above, p. 546). In this case *verbum* does not strictly mean the form. *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 400-406.

⁵ See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 400-406.

on his holiness. In a general way Augustine affirms that the dispositions of the *minister* have no effect on the sacrament²³. Bad dispositions³ in the *subject* do not destroy the validity of the sacrament⁴; but they suspend the production of grace until the sinner or the schismatic has retracted them; grace is then vouchsafed and the sacrament produces all its fruits⁵. For grace is evidently not the effect of the moral dispositions of the subject, which can neither merit nor produce it, but which constitute nevertheless the necessary condition for its reception; it is the effect of the sacrament, which, as it were, lives again. Such is the theory of the theologians regarding the *reviviscence of the sacraments* 6.*

In what manner does Augustine conceive this production of grace? He insists a great deal on the fact that the minister is only the instrument of Christ, Who operates truly in souls through the medium of the minister, and hides His sanctifying action under the sacred rite?; or again, the Holy Ghost Who operates under the outwardly visible sacrament⁸, just as in preaching He acts inwardly while the voice of the preacher alone is heard by the faithful?. In spite of the significance or the symbolism of the rite, he recognises that it, as well as the minister, plays a very real though subordinate part in the production of grace. From this elementary data the theologians of the Middle Ages were one day to derive the theory of the instrumental causality of the sacraments.

3. The Holy Eucharist did not receive such close attention (rom Augustine as the sacraments we have just treated. He often spoke of this great Sacrament, before all as an orator and mystic, chiefly desirous of stressing the spiritual

¹ He made no reservations as regards validity, nor as regards efficacy in the case of sacraments received in the true Church; but he hesitated as regards those, which, except in the case of danger of death, are administered by a schismatic minister, even to a catechumen in good faith. J. Tixeront, *ibid.*, p. 403-404.

³ His reasons are: a) the custom of not repeating the sacraments of Baptism and Order; b) the character conferred by the sacraments; c) the distinction between the principal minister, who is Jesus Christ, and the secondary minister, the man. See *ibid.*, p. 401-403.

³ For the intention of the minister or of the subject see *ibid.*, p. 406-407.

⁴ *De baptismo*, bk. VI, c. V, 7. Cf. bk. IV, c. XII, 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, bk. VI, c. V, 7. *Cont. epist. l'arm.*, bk. II, c. XIII, 28.

⁶ Saint Augustine also held a rather curious opinion on the reviviscence of sins. *De bapt.*, bk. I, c. XII, 19, 20.

¹ *Epist.* 89, 5. *Cont. Utt. Petit.*, bk. III, c. XLIX, 59.

⁸ *Epist.* 98, 2. *Cont. Epist. Parin.*, bk. II, c. Xi, 23-24.

^{*} *bi foann.*, tract. LVII, 3.

profit to be drawn from the doctrine he explained 13: from this it has been too hastily concluded that he denied the *Real Presence*. But the evident symbolism of his phrases in no way excludes the reality of the Eucharistic Presence, and on the other hand this reality is implied in many of the Bishop's allegorical passages a, for instance by those numerous passages in which he affirms "the traditional equation of the bread to the Body and of the wine to the Blood of Christ" 3, and still more clearly by those in which he shows how the unworthy man, without faith or charity, receives the Body and Blood of Christ to his condemnation 4, or again by the other passages in which he teaches the necessity of the Eucharist, even for little children 5. But the reality of the Eucharistic Body of Christ 6 does not prevent Augustine from regarding it as also a *figure of His Church*, which is His mystical body, and the symbol of the union of all Christians in charity 7; this idea in one of those which best characterise the Augustinian Eucharistic teaching 8. The Eucharist is a sacrifice which reproduces that of the Cross; in both, there is the same priest and the same victim. Saint Augustine does not treat the subject at length, but what he says of it is quite clear and leaves no doubt as to his meaning 9.

4. Other Sacraments.

a) Saint Augustine also applies the name of "sacrament" to Confirmation (administered immediately after Baptism by the laying on of hands by the Bishop) and to marriage, although in this case it

1 See chiefly P. Batiffol, *VEucharistie*, p. 422-453.

2 Nor must we omit to take into account the discipline of the secret, of which Augustine often speaks. *Senn.* 4, n. 31; 5, n. 7; 307, n. 3. *In Joann.*, tract. III, n. 3, 4. See J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 412.

3 *Enarr. in Es.* 48, 9; *Enarr. in Es.* 33; *Senn.* II, 10. See P. Batiffol, *ibid.*, 434-437. — 4 *Senn.* 17: *De baptismo*, bk. V, c. vili, 9.

5 *Senn.* 174, 7; *Epist.* 186, 28; 217, 16.

6 See E. Portalié (*op. cit.*, col. 2419-2422) on a number of theories implied by the Real Presence.

7 O Sacramentum pietatis! o signum unitatis! o vinculum caritatis. *In Joann.*, tract. XXVI, 13.

8 *Serm.* 57, 7; 227; 229. *In Jocum*, tract. XXVI, 13-15. See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2424-2426.

9 See chiefly *De Civ. Dei*, bk. X, c. IV-V, XIX-XX. *Contra Faust.*, bk. XX, c. XXI. *Epist.* 98. Cf. M. Lbpin, *L'idée du sacrifice de la Messe*, Paris, 1926, p. 37 sq. 10 *De Trinit.*, bk. XV, c. XXVI, 46; *In Ep. Joann.*, tract. III, 5, 12; VI, tu; *De baptismo*, bk. III, c. XVI, 2t. See Gaitikr, *Rock. Se. Rei.* 1911. P. 359-368. Confirmation is not to be repeated; it should not be confused with the laying on of hands for the reconciliation of heretics.

implies its indissolubility (symbol of the union of Christ with the Church) rather than marriage itself; moreover, Augustine treats of the conjugal state sanctified by the sacrament rather than the sacrament *in fieri*

b) Although Augustine did not call penance a sacrament, he clearly explained the doctrine'. After Baptism, penance is necessary, not for venial but for grave sins; it supposes secret confession made to the bishop; satisfaction, which may be public, for known and scandalous faults; and, lastly, an act of ecclesiastical authority pardoning the sinner; even although that spiritual resurrection which is the work of God already takes place in the penitential act³

VI. THE LAST THINGS. CONCLUSION.

Although perhaps less well known, Saint Augustine's influence in this field of theology was extremely important ». He combated with great effectiveness various serious errors, and could thus forcefully maintain the "fundamental truths which guide all Christian life" ⁵.

He dealt a mortal blow to *Millenarianism* by his spiritual interpretation of the Apocalypse⁶* But a greater danger was contained in Jovinian's teaching on salvation by faith without works ⁷. Saint Augustine was adamant in his condemnation of this error⁸ confounding in advance those false disciples who were one day to appeal to his authority: "Neither baptism", he taught, "nor the reception of the Eucharist, nor the orthodoxy of our faith, nor almsgiving alone will save us; but only our lives as a whole and our good works; on the last day not only the unbeliever and the idolater will be damned" ⁹. Hence on the day of *judgment*, the believer cannot be certain of salvation by the fact of his faith alone.

¹ See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 428-429.

* *Enchirid.*, c. lxxiv-lxxxiii 17-22; *Senn.*, 351, 352; etc. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 421-423.

³ See also P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de thiol. pos.*, 1st series, p. 194-224.

⁴ Augustine's eschatological teaching is found chiefly in the *Enchiridion*, c. i.xxxiv-cxm, and the *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XIX-XXII.

⁵ J. Tixeront, *Hist. Dogm.*, II, p. 429. See *ibid.*, 429-431. See also E. PORTALIÉ, *op. cit.*, col. 2443-2453; and the same author's study in *Bull. lift. Eccl.*, 1901, p. 101119, against J. Turmel, *L'eschatologie à la fin du IV^e siècle*, in *Rev. hist. liti. rei.*, 1900, three articles.

⁶ *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XX.

⁷ See above, p. 562, 577, 678.

⁸ *De grat. et lib. arb.*, c. vin, 1920. *De fide et op.*, c. XIV, 21-26; *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XXI, c. xxi-xxvii.

⁹ J. Tixeront, *op. cit.*, p. 431-432. See the errors mentioned p. 592.

The consequences of the Origenist error, which tended to deny the eternity of hell, rendered it no less grave than the foregoing. It had spread in various forms in the West. Saint Augustine had often occasion to deal with it and proved the Catholic teaching by the Scriptures (chiefly *Matth.*, XXV, 41, 46; *Apec.*, XX, 9, 10), and the custom of the Church in not praying for the damned. The punishment of lost souls consists in the loss of divine life (*alienatio a vita Dei*)²; and in the pain caused by fire which tortures them in their spiritual or material being³. Moreover, this torment will not be delayed until after the resurrection, but begins already⁴. Although the error of the "*miseriordes*"¹ I combated by Saint Augustine was widespread at the time, I it was not almost universally admitted as some authors have I supposed. He did not reject in so clear a manner his opinion in favour of a *mitigation* of the pains of hell, although he never sponsored it himself.

Saint Augustine gave a very exact outline of the doctrine I of purgatory, at least as regards its existence, which he establishes on I Corinth., III, II-15. He recognised that there is temporal punishment in the next life, by which souls are purified and which will come to an end with the judgments. He speaks of purifying fire: *emendatorius ignis* \ ■ *ignis purgationis*, *ignis purgatorius*. He hesitated perhaps to give any exact definition of the nature of this fire, but there is no doubt that he admitted the existence of purgatory. Lastly, he taught the usefulness of prayers and good works for the dead, especially the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

For Augustine, heaven consists before all in the vision of God and full possession of the Truth (*gaudium de veritate*), of Perfect Truth, known no longer in a concept or image but

¹ *Ench.*, c. CXI-CXIII; *De civ. Dei.*, bk. XXI, c. xtx-xxvii. See A. Leha Ut I *L'iternité des peines de l'enfer dans S. Augustin*, Paris, 1912.

² *Ench.*, c. cxin.

³ *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XXI, c. IX, 2; X, 1, 2. To Augustine's mind! this fire III material; but he did not impose his opinion, since this doctrinal point was still III process of elucidation. — 4 *567m** 980, 5.

⁵ *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XXI, c. XIII, XVI, XXIV.

⁶ *Enarr.*, In Ps., 37, c. III.

⁷ *De Gen. cent. Man.*, c. XX, 30: *Vel ignem purgationis, vel panam æternam* A

⁸ *Nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium, quantum magis ininn-ivf bona pereuntia delixerunt, tanto tardius citiusque salvari. Enchirid.*, c. t.xiXj See also, *ibid.*, c. cx.

⁹ *Enchirid.*, c. cx; *De 8 Dulc. quest.*, q. II. See also *Confess.*, bk. XI, c. xtt, 32.

in itself by means of a direct and immediate vision, of which contemplative vision is but a feeble imitation. Already the souls of the saints enjoy the Beatific Vision he affirms this explicitly when speaking of the martyrs¹ which proves that he did not consider the fact of the separation of the soul and the body as a hindrance to the reception of the Beatific Vision. He also affirms this in many other texts; should he appear hesitant in some³, it is because he wondered how it was possible for this vision of God to be not only spiritual but also corporeal. At first he regarded this question as pure folly⁴, but he began to hesitate, and finally conceived corporeal vision as being possible and perhaps probable⁵. Such a change of opinion is astounding in Augustine. In all probability this supposed corporeal vision of God must be taken as an exaggeration of the supernatural qualities he attributed to the glorified bodies of the risen. In the last book (xxii) of the *City of God*, Augustine describes the happiness of heaven.

It is evident that this rapid summary of Augustine's immense doctrinal work does not pretend to say all that can be said, or even to indicate it, but an attempt has been made to note the essential points of Augustinian teaching, not indeed in order to develop them, but in order to classify and co-ordinate them, and to show the links which bind them one to another. History can point to no Churchman more perfect than Augustine, for he combined holiness with knowledge, speculation with faith, and action with contemplation in an unparalleled degree. He was moreover the most universal Doctor and the most powerful mind the Church has ever possessed. A great man of letters, he was still more a man of tradition and authority, as well as a

¹ *Enarr. in Ps.* 119, 6; *Confess.*, bk. IX, c. III, 6. *De Civ. Dei*, bk. XX, c. IX, 2.

³ *Senn.*, 329, n. 1-2.

³ *Enchirid.*, c. CIX-CX.

⁴ *Epist.* 92 (to Italica, 408), n. 6.

⁵ In letters 147 (to Paulina, 50-53), 148 (to Fortunatian, 1-2), 162 (to Evodius, 8), written about 413-415, he severely censures this opinion. In sermon 277, 14-16, he tolerates it, on condition that the spiritual nature of God is maintained. In the *City of God* (bk. XXII, c. XXIX, 3) he seems to think that it is more or less probable. See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, 2452.

daring theologian and original thinker. All these great qualities enabled him to study with so much fruit the great mystery of the Trinity, to build up the exact framework of Christian anthropology and the theology of grace, to open up and develop fresh avenues of thought on the Church and the Sacraments and to throw new light on the traditional teaching on the last things. From another point of view he was no less outstanding as a moralist, exhorting souls to the most energetic activity under the guidance of the most intense action of God.

It was inevitable that such a man should attract disciples in all ages. His doctrinal influence has made itself felt through the centuries and is implied in that intellectual movement known as Augustinism. This name is sometimes applied to Augustine's teaching as a whole on grace and liberty, which occupies such a large place in his work. This point of view is admissible and does not lack its advantages.¹³ It has, however, the drawback of narrowing the influence of the great Doctor to one particular point, which after all represents but one aspect of his teaching, and which cannot, without a certain danger, be isolated from the others. It is therefore preferable to give to the word *Augustinism* a wider meaning, more akin to the first sense given it by Portalie.³ We would define it: *the theological tendency which inspires the doctrines and methods proper to Saint Augustine*. And first of all, what may be called *primitive Augustinism* must be carefully distinguished from *mediaeval Augustinism*. The latter was affected by alien influences, such as that of Dionysius the Areopagite, or else developed its own tendencies to excess, such as Platonism, for instance. It was against this latter that the Thomist reaction at the end of the thirteenth century was

¹ *Augustinism* must be distinguished from *Augustinianism*. See E. Portalie, *Augustinianisme*, in *Diet. thiol.*, col. 2485-2501. The latter term would rather indicate the teaching of the theologians of the *Augustinian Order*, especially their doctrine on grace, and that of other theologians connected with it.

² This is one of the meanings given to it by E. Portalie, in the article, *Augustinisme* (*Did. théol.*, col. 2515-2561).

³ "The word, *Augustinism*, signifies sometimes in a general manner Augustine's teaching as a whole, or even a certain philosophical character which imbues it, and more particularly, his teaching on the action of God, and on grace and liberty". *Op. cit.*, col. 2501. We would prefer to say "theological character", for in Saint Augustine, philosophical speculation is almost always dependent on revealed truth.

directed §. But, on the contrary, *primitive*, or better still essential Augustinism is derived only from Augustine and the surer doctrines he elaborated. It would seem to be characterised by the following traits (as has already been pointed out) :

- a) insistency on the *idea of God*, and consequently on the rights of God 2;
- b) exemplarist idealism as the foundation of knowledge 3;
- c) an affective and also synthetic doctrinal method-»;
- it) lastly, a clear-cut morals teaching closely bound up with a wide and deep mysticism 6.

Reduced to these essentials, the "great Augustinism", as Portalié⁷ so excellently puts it, is in no way opposed to *Thomism*, in spite of the differences which distinguish them. Saint Thomas is the greatest and most illustrious of Saint Augustine's disciples, and far from assuming the stand of an opponent, constantly invokes and appeals to Augustine's authority. No one better than the Angel of the School realised the value of the spiritual treasure which Providence had given to the Latin Church in the doctrinal work of the Bishop of Hippo, and he was not slow in exploiting it, with the originality, moreover, of an almost inspired genius. But Saint Thomas, like Saint Anselm and Saint Bonaventure, reflects especially Augustine's *theological* influence. Saint Gregory, statesman and *moralist*, was, like Saint Bernard, influenced by Augustine's teaching, in the *mystical* order. The authority of these great Doctors, all of whom went to Augustine for intellectual guidance, shows us what false Augustinians were the founders of the Protestant and Jansenist movement, in spite of the relative success of their undertakings. To be truly an Augustinian it is not enough to seize on some of the great Doctor's expressions, or even some points of his teaching; all the essential points, and above all the *spirit* of his teaching, which was thoroughly Catholic, must be retained.

⁷ See E. Portalié, *op. cit.*, col. 2512-2514. Cf. above, p. 672.

⁸ See above, p. 674, 685, 693. — ³ See above, p. 643.

⁴ See above, p. 670-672. — ⁵ See p. 695-697.

⁶ See p. 686-688.

¹ *Op. cit.*, col. 2514. "Great Augustinism, with its teaching on God, on divine ideas, on the Trinity, on the Redemption, not to speak of grace, will always retain its intellectual ascendancy".

Much has been said of Saint Augustine's *modernity*. Nothing is more exact; but not because the blessed Doctor wrote several pages in which our psycho-analytic contemporaries see a reflection of themselves, nor because he suffered at one time certain intellectual or moral weaknesses which also afflict the modern mind; but rather because, having known these weaknesses he was cured of them. Such being the case no one is better qualified to teach their remedy — reason as mistress of the passions, with a clear mind docile to a firm faith, and bathed in the light of a burning love. In short, Saint Augustine may still be, in our time as he was in the past, a great master of true wisdom.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

STUDIED OR MENTIONED

A

Abercius, 154.
 Absamya, 385.
 Acacius of Berea, 494.
 Acacius of Cesarea, 316.
Acts (apocryphal), 163-164.
Acts of the Martyrs, 289-290.
Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp, 74.
 Adamantins, 195 and 287.
Addai (Doctrine of), 164.
 Adimantius, 623.
 Adoptianists, 175.
Ad Novatianum, 254, 288.
 Adrian, 498.
 Aetius, 315.
Aleatoribus (De), 288.
 Alexander of Alexandria (St.) 327.
 Alexander of Lycopolis, 369.
 Alexandria (School of), 177 sq. ; and 297.
 Alexandrians, 172 and 297.
Alexandrians (Epistle to), 164.
 Alogi, 106, 140.
 Alypius (Saint), 610.
 Ambrose (St.), 520-547.
 Ambrosiaster, 605.
 Ammonius, 279.
 Ammonius Saccas, 169.
 Ammon (St.), 503.
 Amphilochius of Iconium (St.), 430.
 Anastasius I (St.), 516.
 Anatolius, 279.
Andrew (Acts of), 163.
 Anomoeans, 315.
 Antioch (School of), 298.
 Antiochus of Ptolemais, 494.
 Antony (St.), 502.
 Apelles, 105.
 Aphraates, 376-378.
Apocalypses (apocryphal), 165.
Apocrypha, 156-165.
Apocrypha (Ethiopian), 55.

Apollinaris of Hierapolis, 135.
 Apollinaris of Laodicea, 447-452.
 Apollinarists, 296.
 Apollonius, 139.
Apollonius (Ads of), 290.
 Apologists, 108-114, 128-138.
Apophthegmata, 500.
 Apostolic Fathers, 31-37.
Apostles (Epistle of), 164.
 Apostles (Creed of), 37-42.
Arabic Gospel, 161.
 Arians, 295.
 Aristides, 111.
 Aristo of Pella, 112.
 Arius, 313-314.
 Arnobius the Elder, 270-271.
 Artemon or Artemas, 175.
 Asterius of Amasea, 496.
 Asterius of Cappadocia, 315.
 Athanasius (St.), 336-351.
Athanasius (Creed of), 349.
 Athenagoras, 131.
 Augustine (St.), 612-716.
 Aurelius, 610.
 Ausonius, 551.
Avircius Marcellus (Refutation of Montanism dedicated to), 139.

B

Balai, 385.
 Bardesanes, 376.
llamabas (Acts of), 164.
Barnabas (Epistle of), 78-79.
Barnabas (Gospel of), 160.
 Bar-Sudaili, 220.
Bartholomew (Gospel of), 160.
Bartholomew (Passion of), 164.
 Basil (St.), 406-415.
 Basil of Ancyra, 317.
 Basilides, 103.
 Boniface (St.), 519.
Bono Pudicitier (De), 288.

■ This is not an index of authors quoted, but of those dealt with in the Patrology. The names printed in *thick type* are those of authors or writings to which a whole chapter is devoted.

C

- Cainites, 104.
 Caius, 139.
 Callistus, 223-224.
Callistus (Edict of), 226-229, 244.
Canons (Apostolic), yj2.
Canons (ecclesiastical), 372.
 I Cappadocian Fathers, 406-447.
 Capreolus, 610.
 Carpocrates, 103.
Carpus, Papyrus, Agatjionice (Acts of Saints), 290.
 Cassian, 594-603.
 Cathares, 254.
 Celestine (St.), 519.
 Celsus, 98.
 Cerdo, 104.
 Cerinthus, 103.
 Chromatius of Aquileia, 605.
 Chronographer of the year 345, 568.
 ' Clement of Alexandria, 177-191.
 J Clement of Rome, 52-61.
Clement (Homily, so-called IIInd Epistle of), 79 80.
Clementines, 54.
 Cleomenes, 174.
 Coelestius, 391.
 Commodianus, 269-270.
Computus (De Pascita), 289.
Constitutions (Apostolic), 373.
 Controversialists, 138-140.
Corinthians (correspondence 0] St. Paul -with), 164.
 Cornelius, 259.
Creed (Apostle?), 37-42.
 Cresconius, 627.
 \ Cyprian (St.), 254-268.
Cyprian (Proconsular Acts of), 290.
 Cyprian the Gaul, 550.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 364-369.
 Cyrillona, 385.

D

- Dada, 385.
 Dadjesu, 385.
 Damasus (St.), 513.
Decretal, (five letiers), 53.
Decretals of the Popes, 515.
 Demetrius, 279.
 Dictinius, 607.

- Didache, 43-51.
 Didascalia, 288.
 Didymus the Blind, 400-406.
 Diodorus of Tarsus, 452-454.
Diognetus (Epistle to), 113.
 Dionysius of Alexandria, 275-278.
 Dionysius of Corinth, 153.
 Dionysius of Rome, 277.
 Domitian, 219.
 Donatists, 296, 389.
Dormition of Mary, 162.
 Dorotheus, 281.

E

- Ebionites (Gospel of)*, 159.
Edessena (Acta), 164.
Egyptians (Gospel according to) liso.
 Encratites, 107.
 Endelevchius, 550.
 Ephraem (St.), 378-384.
 Epigonius, 174.
 Epiphanius (St.), 395-400.
Epitome, 372.
Epistles (apocryphal), 164-165.
Ethiopian (apocrypha), 55.
 Euchites, 296.
 Eudoxius, 316.
 Eunomius, 315.
 Eusebius of Cesarea, 319-327.
 Eusebius of Emesa, 316.
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, 314.
 Eusebius of Vercelli, 331.
 Eustathius of Antioch, 328.
 Eustathius of Sebaste, 318.
 Evagrius Ponticus, 506.
 Evagrius, 494.
 Evodius, 610.

F

- Faustus of Milevis, 623.
 Faustinus, 333.
 Firmilian of Cesarea, 282.
 Flavian of Antioch, 494.
 Florinus, 104.
 Fronto of Cirta, 98.

G

- Gaudentius, 605.
 Gelasius of Cesarea, 495.
 George of Laodicea, 316.

Gnostics, 100-104.
 Gregory of Elvira, 333.
 Gregory of Nazianzus (St.), 415-423.
 Gregory of Nyssa (St.), 423-430.
 Gregory the Syrian, 385.
 Gregory Thaum. (St.), 283-284.

H

Hadrian, 498.
Hebrews (Gospel of), 159.
 Hegemonius, 569.
 Hegesippus, 140.
 Helvidius, 577.
 Heracleon, 104.
 Hennas, 83-96.
 Hermias, 135.
 Hesychius, 279.
 Hieracas, 279.
 Hilarianus, 568.
 Hilary of Poitiers (St.), 355-364.
 Hilary of Rome, 333.
 Hippolytus, 220-229.
Hippolytus (38 canons of), 372.
Hippolytum (Constitutiones per), 372.
 Homoeans, 316.
 Homoiousians, 316-319.
 Hosius of Cordova, 331.

I

Ignatius of Antioch (St.), 61-73.
 Innocent I (St.), 516.
 Instantius, 607.
 Irenaeus (St.), 141-153. V
 Isaac of Amid, 385.
 Isaac of Antioch, 385.
 Isidorus, 103.
 Isidorus of Pelusium, 498.
 Ithacius, 607.
Itinerarium burdigalense, 567.

J

James (Protoevangelium of), 160.
 Jerome (St.), 569-593.
John (Acts of), 163.
 John Chrysostom (St.), 460-493.
 John of Jerusalem, 495.
Jona et Ninive (De), 550.
Joseph the Carpenter (History of), 162.
 Jovinian, 577.

Judas Iscariot (Gospel of), 160.
 Judaeo-Christians, 99-100.
 Julius Africanus, 279.
 Julian of Eclanum, 394.
 Justin (St.), 114-129.
Iustin (Acts of), 290.
 Juvencus, 554.

L

Lactantius, 271-274.
Laodiceans (Epistle to), 164.
 Latronianus, 607.
Laude martyrii, 289.
Laudes Domini, 550.
 Leporius, 634.
Letters to the Virgins (Two), 81-82.
 Liberius, 333-335.
Lives of Fathers of the Desert, 500.
 Lucian of Samosata, 281.
 Lucian of Samosata (St.), 98.
 Lucifer of Cagliari, 332.
Lyons and Vienne (Letters of the Churches of), 290.

M

Macarius of Alexandria, 503.
 Macarius the Great (St.), 505.
 Macarius Magnés, 495.
 Macedonians, 285.
 Macedonius, 318.
 Malchion, 281.
 Manichaeans, 170 and 296.
 Mar Aba, 385.
 Marathionians, 285.
 Marathonius, 318.
 Mark the Hermit, 508.
 Marcellus of Ancyra, 330.
 Marcion, 104.
 Marius Victor, 550.
 Marius Victorinus, 331.
 Marouta, 385.
Martyrology (so called, of St. ferrente), 568.
Mathias (Gospel, Traditions of), 160.
Matthew (Gospel of Pseudo-), 161.
Matthew (Martyrium of St.), 164.
 Meletius of Antioch, 329.
 Melito of Sardes, 135.
Melitonis (Oratio), 135.
 Menander, 103.

Methodius of Olympus, 285-286.
 Millenarianists, 106.
 Miltiades, 134.
 Minucius Felix, 136-138.
 Modalists, 173 and 295.
 Montanus, 105.
Muratorius (Canon of), 155-156.

N

Nativity of Mary (Gospel of), 161.
 Nemestus, 496.
 Neo-Platonists, 168-170.
 Nepos, 279.
 Nestorians, 296.
 Nicetas of Remesiana, 603-604.
Nicodemus (Gospel of), 162.
 Nilus of Sinai, 507.
 Noetus, 174.
 Novatianum (ad), 254, 288.
 Novatian, 250-254.
 Novatian and Novatianists, 252.

O

Ocateuch of Clement, 374.
Odes of Solomon, 157.
 Olympius, 607.
 Ophites, 104.
 Optatus of Milevis, 608-610.
 Optatianus Porphyrius, 548.
 Oracles (Sibylline), 165.
 Orientius, 550.
 1 Origen, 191-220.
 Origenists, 217-220, 296.
 Orosius (Paulus), 560-562.
 Osius of Cordova, 331.

P

Pachomius (St.), 504.
 Pacianus (St.), 606.
 Palladius, 501.
 Pamphilus, 280.
 Pantaenus, 178.
 Papias, 76-77.
Paradise of Heraclides, 500.
 Parmenianus, 390.
Pascha computus (De), 289.
 Pastor, 607.
Paul (Acts of), 163.
Paul (Apocalypse of), 165.
Paul (correspondence of), 164.
Paul (preaching of), 163.
 Paul of Samosata, 175-176.

Paulus Orosius, 560-562.
 Paulinus of Beziers, 552.
 Paulinus of Noia, 551-554.
 Paulinus of Pella, 552.
 Paulinus of Perigueux, 552.
 Paulonias, 385.
 Pectorius, 154.
 Pelagius, 392.
 Pelagians, 296 and 389.
Peregrinatio ad loca sancta, 567.
Perpetua and Felicitas (Passion of Saints), 290.
Peter (Acts of), 163.
Peter (Apocalypse of), 165.
Peter (Gospel of), 162.
Peter (Preaching of), 163.
Peter and Paul (Acts of the Apostles), 163.
Peter by Clement (Apocalypse of), 165.
 Peter of Alexandria, 279.
 Petilianus, 391.
 Pettau (St. Victorious of), 274.
 Philastrius, 604.
 Phileas, 279.
Philip (Acts of), 164.
Philip (Gospel of), 160.
 Philo of Carpasia, 495.
 Philostorgius, 318.
 Phoebadius, 332.
 Photinians, 295.
 Pierius, 274.
Pistis Sophia, 104.
 Plotinus, 169.
 Pneumatomachi, 295.
 Polycarp (St.), 73-75.
Polycarp (Martyrdom of), 290.
 Polychronius of Apamea, 496.
 Polycrates, 153.
 Pontianus, 250.
 Porphyry, 169.
 Possidius, 611.
 Praxeas, 174.
 Priscillianists, 296 and 667.
 Priscillian, 606-668.
 Proba, 548.
 Prudentius, 554-558.
 Ptolemy, 104.

Q

Quadratus, no.
 Quarto-decimans, 140.
Quicumque vult, 349.

R

Rabulas, 385.
Rebaptismate (De), 1H.
Recognitiones, 54.
 Reticius of Autun, 274.
 Rhodo, 146.
 Rufinus, 562-567.

S

Sabellians, 295.
 Sabellius, 174.
 Sabinus, 318.
 Saccas Amtnonius, 169.
 Saturninus or Satornil, 103.
Sayings, 500.
 Schenoudi, 505.
Scillium (Acts of the Martyrs of), 290.
 Secundinus, 624.
 Sedulius, 548.
Seneca (Correspondence of Saint Paul and), 164.
 Serapion of Antioch, 153.
 Serapion of Thmuis, 370.
 Sethians, 104.
 Severian of Gabala, 494.
 Severus Sanctus, 550.
Sibylline Oracles, 165.
 Silvia (Pseudo-), 567.
 Simon Magus, 103.
 Simplicianus (St.), 605.
 Siricius (St.), 516.
Sodoma (De), 550.
Solomon (Odes of), 157.
Spectaculis (De), 288.
 Stephen I (St.), 260.
 Stephen (Apocalypse of), 165.
 Sulpicius Severus, 558-560.
 Syagrius, 607.
 Sympronianus, 606.
 Synesius of Cyrene, 496.
 Synousiastes, 452.

T

Tatian, 130-131.
Te Deum, 535, 604.

Tertullian, 229-249, 375.
Testament of Our Lord, 372.
Thaddeus (Acts of), 164.
Thaddeus (Gospel of), 160.
 Theodore Askidas, 219.
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 455-460.
 Theodore, monk of the I'hebaïd, 504.
 Theodotus, the Banker, 175.
 Theodotus the Elder, 175.
 Theognostus, 278.
 Theophilus of Alexandria, 496.
 Theophilus of Antioch (St.), 133-134.
Theophilus (Monastic History of Theodoret of Cyrus), 500.
Thomas (Acts of), 164.
Thomas (Apocalypse of), 165.
Thomas (Gospel of), 160.
Thomas the Israelite (Gospel of), 160.
 Titus of Bostra, 370.
 Traditionalist (School), 300.
Traditions of Mathias, 160.
Transitus sanctae Mariae, 162.
 Tropicists, 285.
 Trypho, 279.
 Turribius, 607.
 Tychonius, 391.

V

Valentine, 104.
 Victor (St.), 153.
 Victorinus of Pettau (St.), 274.
 Victorinus (Marius), 331.
 Vigilantius, 577.
 Vincent of Lerins, 18.
 Virgins (Two letters to the), 81-82.

Z

Zenobius, 385.
 Zeno (St.), 332.
 Zosimus (St.), 519.

DOCTRINAL INDEX¹.

I. — PATRISTIC DATA FOR THE INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY.

A) GENERAL DATA.

1. Doctrine.—Notion : it comprises dogma and moral, 4-5. Sources of doctrine, see B, Holy Scripture.

2. Dogma.—Notion, 4. History of dogma, 4, 17-19. Development of dogma, 18. Fourth century development, 301-303. See II, Data RELATIVE TO THE FAITH.

3. Moral.—Notion, 20. Moral and ascetic theology, 20. Moral and mystical theology, 19. Moral and moralism, 30. See HI (A), Moral theology.

4. Moralism.—Notion, 30. Moralism and mysticism, 30. See *Patristic moral theology*.

5. Theology.—Dogmatic theology, Moral theology, see *Domna Alerai*. Positive theology, 4. Patristic theology, 4. Ascetic theology, 20-22. See *Mystical theology*. Affirmative and negative theology, 182-184, 189 (Clement Alex.). Object of theology according to Origen, 210-211. *Faith and reason*, 109 (Apologists); 124 (St. Justin) 179 (Clement Alex.); 210 (Origen); 302 (fourth cent.); 667-669 (Saint Augustine). Notion of theology according to St. Augustine, 670-672; characters, 670-672. See *Augustinism*. Qualities of the theologian, 421 (St. Gregory Naz.).

6. Theological Summas (early).—See 144-146 (St. Irenaeus); 197-200, 210-211 (Origen); 272 (Lactantius); 426(81. Gregory of Nyssa); 650-651 (St Augustine).

7. Origins of theology.—The Apologists, 108-110. The Controversialists, 170 sq., 173. The Alexandrians, 173, 178 sq., 201 sq. Popular opposition, 171. Fourth century developments, 301-303, 387-389.

8. Doctrinal tendencies.—Moralism and mysticism, 30; Alexandrian mysticism, 173; 185-188; 201-204. Schools.—School of Alexandria, 297-298. School of Antioch, 298-300. Traditionalist School, 300. School of Edessa, 379. Augustinian School, 713-716. Augustinism, 714. See also 669-672. Augustinianism, 714.

9. Philosophy.—Confidence of Apologists, 108-110. The *Logos* in Saint Justin, 120-124. The seminal word, 123-124. St. Irenaeus, 145. The Alexandrians, 188-189, 205-266. Antioch, 281. See *Schools*. In the West, 246 (Tertullian); 226-227 (Hippolytus); 274 (Lactantius). The fourth cent, in the East, Cappadocians, 432 sq.; St. J. Chrysostom, 471-472; Nemesius, 496; Synesius, 496; St. Isidore, 498. Apollinaris'

¹ At the end of this index will be found an *alphabetical index* of the subjects treated. The *numbers* refer to the /<zy>« of this volume.

excesses, 449; Theodore, 460. *In the jVest*, Victorinas, 331; St. Hilary, 360; St. Augustine, 667; see also 624 and 640-643. Philosophy, *moral perfection*, see *Christian perfection*.

B) HOLY SCRIPTURE.

10. The Scriptures, source of doctrine.—The Apostolic Fathers, 32-33; in St. Justin, 127; in St. Irenaeus, 142, 151; in Clement of Alex., 189-190; in Origen, 203-204; in Tertullian, 246; in St. Cyprian, 257. In the fourth cent., see Schools of Alex. and Antioch, 297-300; St. Athanasius, 351; St. Hilary, 361; the Cappadocians, 433; St. John Chrysostom, 485-486; St. Ambrose, 522, 528, 540; St. Jerome, 587 sq.; Saint Augustine, 653, 658, 666.

11. Canon of the Scriptures.—*Ohl Testament*: in Origen, 196-197, 200 (Deutero-canonical bks.); 280 (J. Africanus); 580 sq. (St. Jerome). New Testament: Canon of Muratori, 155-156. Alogi, 106. *The Canon as a whole*: Decree of Gelasian, 514; St. Augustine, 666. Errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 457-488. Apocrypha; 156-165.

12. Text of the Scriptures.—*Revisions*: 187-188 (Origen); 281 (Lucian); 573-574, 580-581 (St. Jerome). *Translation*: 581 (St. Jerome). Gospel summaries, 130, 375, 380 (Tatian); 325 (Eusebius). *Poetical adaptations*: 548-549 (Proba, Sedulius); 554 (Juvencus). *Biblical anthologies*: 257, 262 (St. Cyprian); 412 (St. Basil); 653 (St. Augustine).

13. Exegesis. Biblical senses.—*Preliminary notions*: true Scriptural senses, 29; spiritual accommodations, 29. *Alexandrian doctrine*: 199 (*Peri-Archon*, bk. iv); Origen's exegetical method, 206-209; allegorism, 207 sq.; mystical foundation, 203-204; advantages and dangers, 208-209. Chief representatives of the School: Alexandrians of the third cent., 264 sq.; St. Athanasius, 349; Didymus, 402; Cappadocians, 432; St. Ambrose, 522, 539; St. Jerome, 581-585; St. Augustine, 639. *Adversaries of allegorista*: St. Peter of Alexandria, 279; St. Lucian, 270; St. Methodius, 285; St. Eustathius, 319; the Antiochians, 298 sq.—*School of Antioch*: St. Lucian, 281. The theory of the School, 453 (Diodorus); 457-458 (Theodore); 498 (Adrian, St. Isidore of Pelusium). Other chief representatives of this School: St. Ephraem, 380; Apollinaris, 449; St. John Chrysostom, 485-486; St. Jerome, 584; Ambrosiaster, 605; St. Augustine, 659-656. The perfect understanding of the Scriptures is a gift of God, 125 (St. Justin); 203 (Origen); 353 (St. Athanasius); 585 (Cassian); 663, 669 (St. Augustine). See *the superior graces*.

14. Value of the Scriptures.—Exaggerated allegorism of the Ps.-Barnabas, 78. Aristides' depreciation of the Jews, in-112. The Bible anterior to Pagan writings: 119, 123 (St. Justin); 131 (Tatian); 134 (St. Theophilus); 184 (Clement of Alex.). Argument from prophecy in Aristo, 113; St. Justin, 118-119. See the *apologies against the Jews*, and refutations of *Manichaeans*. Errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia on Messianism, 449.

15. Homilies.—Chief authors of homilies: Origen, 196-197; St. Basil 413; St. Greg. of Nyssa, 429; St. John Chrys., 478; St. Ambrose, 529; St. Augustine, 656-657. See also 222 (Hippolytus); 326 (Eusebius); 381 (St. Ephraem, poetical homilies); 494 (Severian of Gabala); 496 (Asterius); 581 (St. Jerome). Principles, in St. Augustine, 653, 658.

16. Commentaries.—Chief authors of commentaries: Origen, 197; Eusebius of Ces., 325; St. Athanasius, 346; St. Hilary, 359; St. Ephraem, 382; St. Greg. of Nyssa, 428-429; Diodorus of Tarsus, 454; Theodore of Mops., 458; Ambrosiaster, 605; St. Jerome, 581; St. Augustine, 655-656. See also, 134 (St. Theophilus of Ant.); 180 (Clement of Alex.); 221 (Hippolytus); 274 (Reticus); 274 (Victorious of Pettau); 490 (Polychromius); 565 (Rufinus).

(C) TRADITION.

17. Tradition in the Fathers.—In the Apostolic Fathers, 75 (Presbyters). Rules of St. Irenaeus, 147-148; of Origen, 204; of Tertullian (236, 246: prescription). Saint Stephen's "*Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est*", 261. Tradition in the fourth cent., 303 and 433-434. Saint Ephraem's traditional sense, 384; the Cappadocians, 433; St. John Chrysostom, 484; St. Jerome, 588; St. Augustine 666; the Traditionalist School, 300. Errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia, 457, and the heretics: see (E) Doctrinal Errors.

18. Oral tradition.—In the Apostolic period 75. In the fourth cent., 303, 433-434. Defects in Clement of Alexandria, 188.

19. The magisterium of the Church.—The Church possesses the charisma of truth, 147 (St. Irenaeus); 493 (St. J. Chrysost.); 666, (St. Augustine). The Church is *the rule of faith*, 141 (St. Irenaeus); 204 (Origen); 384 (St. Ephraem); 399 (St. Epiphanius); 433 (Cappadocians); 493 (St. J. Chrysost.); 588 (St. Jerome); 666 (St. Augustine); see also 705. See *liishofs*, and also (II) Church, and *Roman Church*.

20. Creeds.—The Apostles' Creed, 37-42; its teaching, 33-34; commentaries: 565 (Rufinus); 694 (Nicetas); 644, 651, 653 666 (St. Augustine). Other Creeds: Nicaea, 320, 327; Nicaea-Constantinople, 424: See St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 368; St. Epiphanius, 398. Creed of St. Greg. Thaum., 283. The *Quicumque*, 349. Arian pseudo Creeds, 282, 312.

21. Rites.—Liturgical customs possess a *doctrinal significance*, 301, 433-434. Child baptism, 630. *Liturgical documents*: Didache, 45-46, 49-50; St. Justin's 1st Apology, 119, 128; Apostolic Tradition, 224; St. Cyril's Catecheses, 367; Serapion's Sacramentary, 370; Apostolic Constitutions, 373-374; *Peregrinatio Silviae*, 567.

22. Bishops.—The teaching office of the Bishop, 66 (St. Ignatius). Bishop is a doctor and judge of the faith, 204 (Origen). The living magisterium of the Church, 147 (St. Irenaeus); 265 (St. Cyprian). See *Councils*. Conditions required for validity, apostolicity, 147-148 (St. Irenaeus); 140 (Hegesippus). Duties of the Bishop, see III (C) Pastoral Theology.

23. Apostolic See: Doctrinal character: see II (E), Church and *Roman Church*.

24. Councils.—The first Councils, 143, 153. African Councils, 259 sq. The episcopal college according to St. Cyprian, 265. In the fourth cent., 293, 301, 307. Council of Nicaea, 301, 320-321, 327. Council of Sardica, 339. 1st Council of Constantinople, 418, 425. African Councils in St. Augustine's time, 622, 630-633. Distinction between general and particular Councils, 434 (Cappadocians): 705

(St. Augustine). Treatises *de Synodis*, 346 (St. Athanasius); 358 (St. Hilary).

25. The Fathers.—Notion, 1-3. Fathers and Doctors of the Church, 3. Patrology: definition, 1; object, 4-6; general method and divisions, 6-9; importance, 9-12; texts and collections, 12-15; studies on the Fathers, 14-19. Apostolic Fathers: character of their writings, 31-33; teaching, 33-37. Apostolic writings: see *index to Authors*. Theological argument drawn from the Fathers, 301. St. Augustine, 666. First writings on the Fathers, 14, 585 (*De viris illustribus*, St. Jerome).

D) APOLOGETICS AND CONTROVERSY.

26. The Apologists.—Notion, 108-109. Division, 109. Interest of their works, 109. Teaching on the Word, 109. Immortality of the soul, 110. *First apologists against the Pagans*, in the second cent.: Quadratus, no; Aristides, in sq.: Ep. to Diognetus, 113 sq.; St. Justin, 114 sq.; Tatian, 130 sq.; Athenagoras, 131 sq.; St. Theophilus of Antioch, 133 sq.; Miltiades, Apollinarius, Melito, 134-135; Hermias, 135; Minutius Felix, 136 sq.

27. Apologetics in the third century.—Chiefly represented by: Clement of Alex., 180; Origen, 199; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 234-235; St. Cyprian, 256, 260; Cominodian, 269; Arnobius, 270; Lactantius, 271-273; St. Methodius, 285.

28. Apologetics in the fourth century.—Chief authors: Eusebius, 320, 325, 326; St. Athanasius, 345; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. of Nyssa, 426-427; Apollinaris, 448; St. John Chrysost., 476; Macarius Magnes, 495; St. Ambrose, 524; Prudentius, 555-556; P. Orosius, 561; St. Augustine, 644, 648 sq.

29. Apologetics against the Jews.—Epistle of the Pseudo Barnabas, 78-79; Aristo of Pella, 112-113; St. Justin, 118-119; Miltiades, 134; Apollinarius, 135; St. Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 235; Eusebius, 325; St. J. Chrysost., 479; Prudentius, 555.

30. Controversialists.—Notion, 138. Apologetics and controversy, 108, 139. *Chief controversialists*: St. Irenaeus, 144-146; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 235-239; St. Athanasius, 344-346; St. Hilary, 346; St. Basil, 414; St. Greg. Naz., 420-422; St. Greg. Nyssa, 426-427; Apollinaris, 448; Th. of Mopsuestia, 458; St. J. Chrysost., 479; St. Jerome, 585; St. Pacianus, 606; St. Optatus, 608; St. Augustine, 622-637. See also the adversaries of all the errors mentioned below, *Authors of general treatises against or on the heresies*: St. Irenaeus, 144-146; St. Hippolytus, 223; St. Epiphanius, 398; Philastrius, 604; St. Augustine, 637.

E) DOCTRINAL ERRORS COMBATED BY THE FIRST FATHERS.

31. Errors regarding God and the world.—a) Gnosticism, 100-104. Nature, 100-101. Doctrinal synthesis, 102. History and division: Syrian Gnosis, Alexandrian Gnosis, Valentinism, 103-104. Aeons, syzygies, 102. Pleroma, 102. Demiurge, 102. Apocatastasis,

102. Ogdoad, 103. Gnostic Gospels, 160. Acts, 164. *Adversaries*, St. Ignatius, 70; St. Theophilus of Ant., 134; Rhodo, Hegesippus, 140; St. Irenaeus, 144 sq.; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 237; *De recta in Deum fide*, 287; St. Methodius, 285.—b) Marcionism, 104 (Origin, teaching, organisation). *Adversaries*: Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 237; Prudentius, 555; St. Augustine, 624.—c) Manichaeism, 170 (Origin, teaching, organisation); 296 (Notion). *Adversaries*, 369 (various); 403 (Didymus); 555 (Prudentius); 616, 617, 622-624 (St. Augustine), d) Priscillianism, 606-607 (Origin, doctrine, writers); 296, notion. *Adversaries*, *boT*, see Augustine, 624.—e) Religious syncretism, 167; Mithraism, 168, Neo-Platonism, 168-170, are all new forms of Paganism.

32. Errors regarding the Trinity.—a) Unitarianism, see *Modalism* and *Adoptianism*. b) Modalism, also called Monarchianism, Patripassianism, Sabellianism, 173-176 (general notion, followers, teaching). *Adversaries*: Hippolytus, 222-223; Tertullian, 237-239; St. Dion. of Alex., 276.—c) Adoptianism, 175 (notion, propagators). Paul of Samosata, 175-176 (his teaching, *ὁμοούσιον*, his condemnation). See Lucian, 281. *Adversaries*: Hippolytus, 222; Malchion, 281. d) Arianism. *Historical development*, 307-312. *Propagators*: Arius (life, works, teaching), 313-314; Eusebius of Nicomedia, 314; Asterius of Cappadocia, 315. *Anomoean sect*: Aetius, 315; Eunomius, 315; Eudoxius, 316. *Homoean sect*: Acacius of Caesarea, 316; Eusebius of Emesa, 316; George of Laodicea, 316. *Homoiousian sect*, or Semi-Arians: Basil of Ancyra, 317; Eustathius of Sebaste, 318; Macedonius, 318. *Historians*: Sabinus, 318; Philostorgius, 319; Eusebius of Caesarea, 319-327. *Adversaries*. *In the East*: St. Alex. of Alexandria, 327-328; St. Eustathius of Antioch, 328-329; Marcellus of Ancyra, 330; St. Athanasius, 336-344; St. Cyril of Jerusalem, 364-367; St. Epiphanius, 398; Didymus, 400-405; St. Basil, 409-410, 414; St. Greg. Naz., 416-417; St. Greg. Nyssa, 424, 425, 426; St. Amphilocheus, 430; Apollinaris, 448; Diodorus, 454; Theodore, 458; St. J. Chrysost., 478; *In the West*: Osius, 331; St. Eusebius of Vercelli, 331; M. Victorious, 331; St. Zeno, 332; Phoebadius, 332; Lucifer of Cagliari, 332; St. Hilary, 355-356; Liberius, 334-335; St. Damasus, 513-514; St. Ambrose, 522, 533; St. Augustine, 637, 645-648.—e) Photinism, 315, 330; f) Pneumatomachi, 295, 318. *Adversaries*, the same, as for Arianism at the end of the fourth century.

33. Errors concerning Christ and Our Lady.—a) Judaeo-Christians, 99-100. Writings: 159-160 (apocryphal gospels); 163 (preaching of Peter); 54 (Clementines). *Adversaries*: Apostolic Fathers, 341 St. Ignatius, 70; Prudentius, 555. b) QDoeetism, combated by Apost. Fathers, 34, 70. See also 104 (Marcionism); 162 (Gospel of Peter); 190 (Clement of Alex.); 237 (Tertullian); 363 (St. Hilary).—c) Apollinarianism, 296, 449-452. Beginnings, 449; historical development, 449-450; doctrinal system, 451. The sect, 452. *Adversaries*: St. Athanasius, 342, 348; St. Epiphanius, 399; St. Basil, 410; St. Greg. Naz., 423; St. Greg. Nyssa, 427; Diodorus, 454; Theodore, 459. d) Nestorianism, 296, 454 (Diodorus); 459-460 (Theodore), e) Antidico-Marianites, 400. See also Bonosus, 432, and Helvidius, 577.

34. Errors regarding the Church.—a) Novatianism, 252, 254 (origin, error regarding the Church and sins). *Adversaries*: St. Cyprian, 258; Reticius, 274; St. J. Chrysost., 466; St. Ambrose, 533; 1

St. Pacianus, 606. *b*) Donatista, 296, 389-391 (origin, doctrine, organisation, controversies, writers). *Adversaries*: St. Optatus, 608; Saint Augustine, 625-629. *c*) Luviferianism, 332. Writers of this sect. 333. St. Jerome's opposition, 576.

35. *Errors concerning Christian morality.*—*e*) Enoratism, 107; 130 (Tatian); 318 (Eustathius of Seb.); 431. See also 90 (Hermas). *ζ*) Montanism, 105-106 (Origin, doctrine, moral teaching, sects). Tertullian, 231 sq. *Adversaries*: 139 (anonymous, Apollonius, Caius); 222 (Hippolytus).—*c*) Euchites, 203; 431. See 505 (St. Macarius).—*d*) Pelagianism, 391. Doctrine, 391-392. Impeccantia, 579. History, 392-394. Pelagius, 392; Julian of Eclanum, 394; Theodore of Mopsuestia, 459. *Adversaries*: Popes, 518, 519; P. Orosius, 560; St. Jerome, 578, 591; St. Augustine, 630-635. *e*) Semi-Pelagianism, 601-603 (Cassian). Saint Augustine's opposition, 635-637. See also 578 (St. Jerome), *f*) Jovinian's Laxism, 577; Vigilantius, 577.

36. *Errors regarding the Last Ends.*—*α*) Millenarianism, 106; 76-77 (Papias); 128 (St. Justin); 153 (St. Irenaeus); 163 (apocryphal gosp.); 269 (Commodianus); 274 (Victorious of Pettau); 273 (Lactantius); 276, 279 (Nepos).—*Adversaries*: Origen, 213; St. Dionys. of Alex., 276; St. Augustine, 711. See also *Montanism*, 105-106.—*β*) Origenism, 217-220. See 213, 296. Followers: Didymus, 404; Evagrius, 507. See also 280 (Pamphilus); 320 (Eusebius); 562 (Rufinus); 590 (St. Jerome); 547 (St. Ambrose). *Adversaries*: 279 (St. Peter of Alex.); 285 (St. Methodius); 329 (St. Eustathius); 396 (St. Epiphanius). *The great Origenist controversy*: 396-397, 468-469 (St. J. Chrysost.); 496 (Theophilus); 562-563 (Rufinus); 574-575 (St. Jerome); 516 (St. Anastasios I). St. Augustine's contrary teaching, 711.

37. *Various Errors.*—*α*) Alogi, 106; 139 (Caius). *Adversaries*, Hippolytus, 222. *β*) Quartodecimans, 140, 143, 153.

II. PATRISTIC DATA CONCERNING THE FAITH (DOGMA).

A) GOD, HIS NATURE AND HIS WORK.

38. *The knowledge of God.*—*Idea of God*, in the apologies of Aristides, 111; of Athenagoras, 133. Possibilities of knowing Him, 126 (St. Justine); moral conditions, 134 (St. Theophilus).—*Existence of God*, proved by the order found in the world, 111 (Aristides); 137 (Minucius); by the changing character of beings, 672 (St. Augustine); by the degrees of perfection, 672 (St. Augustine); by eternal truths, 673; by universal consent, 672. God is *transcendant* but knowable, 126 (St. Justin). Affirmative and negative theology, 189. God cannot be adequately understood, 414, 478. Perfect knowledge of God, or the Gnosis, 186. Reality of mystical knowledge, 663-664 (St. Augustine). God is the direct and primary object of contemplation, 22 (See Contemplation).

39. *The Divine Attributes.*—*a*) The unity of God, 133 (Athenagoras); 137 (Minucius); 148-149 (St. Irenaeus); 237 (Tertullian); 272 (Lactantius). See all the Apologists. See also the controversialists

who refuted *Marcionism*, *Manichaeism*, and *Monarchianism*. *b*) Divine simplicity, 247 (Tertullian); 617, 624 (St. Augustine). See 663. *c*) The Goodness of God, 145 (St. Irenaeus). See all the adversaries of *Gnosticism* and *Manichaeism*. Saint Augustine's teaching on this point, 624, 674. *d*) Truth and Wisdom. 643, 663, 674 (St. Augustine). See below the work of the six days of Creation (*Creation*) and *Providence*. *e*) Divine impassibility, 273 (Lactantius); 284 (St. Greg. Thaum.). God, last end of man, 541 (St. Ambrose); His happiness, 698 (St. Augustine).

40. *Creation*, 145 (St. Irenaeus); 237 (Tertullian). *Ex nihilo*, 126 (St. Justin); 190 (Clement of Alex.); eternal creation, 213 (Origen); in time, 285 (St. Methodius); 676 (St. Augustine). *Creation by the Word*, *no* (Apologists); 126 (St. Justin); 227 (Hippolytus). See the *Word*. *Creation, work of the Trinity*, 189-190 (Clement of Alex.); 676 (St. Augustine). *The work of six days*, 275 (Victorinus of Pettau); 413 (St. Basil); 428 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 529 (St. Ambrose); 676 (St. Augustine). *Goodness of Creation*, 272 (Lactantius); 624, 654 (St. Augustine). *Creation the image of God*, 643, 663, 671, 685 (St. Augustine); source of poetical inspiration, 553 (St. Paulinus).—Angels. False Gnostic conception refuted by St. Irenaeus, 145. Their origin and classes according to Origen, 199, 213. Their spirituality according to Saint Augustine, 624. Guardian angels according to Hermas, 96.

41. *Providence*.—Proved by the harmony of the world, 55 (Clementines); *nt* (Aristides); 137 (Minucius). Evil has its place in the order willed by God, 641, 676 (St. Augustine). God punishes moral evil, 273 (Lactantius); 477 (St. J. Chrysost.). *Divine Providence in relation to the State*, 561 (P. Orosius); 648-650 (St. Augustine); relative to children who die unbaptised, 428 (St. Greg. Nyssa). See *Predestination*.

42. *Predestination*.—Two wills in God, 489 (St. J. Chrysost.). Cassian's erroneous doctrine; predestination synonymous with fore-knowledge, 602. Saint Augustine's contrary teaching 688-695. *A. Notion*, 688 : difficulties, 688. *B. Augustinian point of view* : 1. the fact known by faith, 690; gratuity of salvation and merit, 691; God wills the salvation of all, 692; the two wills: 692; 2. Free-will and predestination, 692; 3. The essential solution of the mystery: fundamental attributes of God : Truth, Wisdom, Goodness, 693 *C. Advantages* of this teaching, 694; its dangers, 695.

B) THE TRINITY.

43. *The Three Persons*.—Original and fundamental traditional data, 33 (Apost. Fathers); 37 sq. (Creed). Defects in Hennis, 95. Theological development, see *Trinity*.

44. *The Word*.—*a*) The *Word*, or *Christ is truly God*, the Son of God; 33, 34 (Apost. Fathers); 41 (Creed); 55 (Clementines); 70 (St. Ignatius); *no* (Apologists); 112 (Aristo); 118, 127 (St. Justin); 149, 150 (St. Irenaeus); 190 (Clement of Alex.); 199, 211 (Origen). See also the defenders of *consubstantiality*, or theologians of the *Trinity*.—*b*) The *Word* is often regarded as *Creator*: *no* (Apologists); 126 (St. Justin); 173 (Alexandrians); 213 (Origen); 227 (Hippolytus).—

c) The Word is also the *Enlightener*, no., 126, 150, etc.; see (C), *Christ* (names and functions), d) *Various states of the Word*, doubtful theory, 110 (Apologists); 227 (Hippolytus); 251 (Novatian), e) Equal with the Father; see *Subordinationism*. f) Unity of nature with the Father; see *Consubstantiality*. ç) Knowledge of the Word; see the *knowledge of Christ*.

45. Subordinationism.—*Apparent* or relative *subordination* of the Word to the Father: 105 (Apologists); 127 (St. Justin); 133 (Athenagoras); 173 (Alexandrians); 211 (Origen); 247 (Tertullian); 251 (Novatian). Error corrected by Dionysius of Alexandria, 278. Lucian of Antioch's tendencies, 282. Absolute and heretical subordinationism; see *Arianism*.

46. Consubstantiality.—The word ὁμοούσιο, 176 (Paul Samosata); Origen's teaching, 211; St. Dionysius, 278; the word and the doctrine at Nicaea, 301, 320, 322, 327. Adversaries and defenders; see *Arianism*. In the Schools; Alexandria, 297-298; Antioch, 300. Doctrine of the ὁμοούσιο (like in substance) 318 (Basil of Ancyra); 327 (Eusebius). Liberius' attitude, 334; St. Athanasius, 341; St. Hilary, 361; the Cappadocians, 435. Substance (οὐσία) and hypostasis (ὑπόστασις); in St. Athanasius, 349; Didymus, 404; the Cappadocians, 435. The Cappadocians' important role, 435-437; and chiefly St. Basil, 410.

47. The Holy Ghost.—*As Sanctifier*; in St. Irenaeus, 152. See below, Gr a c e. Montanist error, 105. Early theological speculation somewhat brief, 127 (St. Justin); 211 (Origen); 239 (Tertullian); 251 (Novatian). *Divinity and consubstantiality* with the Father and the Son defended, either explicitly or implicitly, in the fourth cent., by St. Athanasius, 348, 350; St. Hilary, 361-362; St. Epiphanius, 399; Didymus, 404; St. Basil, 414; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. Nyssa, 427; St. Ambrose, 533, 545; St. Jerome, 585; St. Nicetas, 604. *Mode of procession*: Eastern point of view, 211 (Origen); 351 (St. Athanasius); 362 (St. Hilary); 438 (Cappadocians); 544 (St. Ambrose); Western point of view, 251 (Novatian); 438 (St. Epiphanius); 675 (St. Augustine).

48. The Trinity.—The word Τριάς, 134 (St. Theophilus of Ant.). The "Plenitude of Divinity", 149 (St. Irenaeus); "the divine economy", 149; 247 (Tertullian). First great *treatises on the Trinity*: Origen (Peri-Archon), 198; Tertullian, 247; Novatian, 250. In the fourth cent., see all the adversaries of Arianism. *Summary explanations*: St. Gregory of Nazianzus' theological discourses, 421-422. Saint Augustine's *De Trinitate*, 645-648. Doctrine of relations, 675. Analogies of the Trinity; various natural analogies (bks. ix-xi) 648; wisdom, perfect image of the Trinity (bks. xn-xiv), 648; see also 675. Saint Augustine seeks to show in what the mystery consists rather than to demonstrate it, 671, 675.

C) CHRIST. OUR LADY. THE SAINTS.

49. Divinity of Christ.—See the *Word*. See Prudentius (Apotheosis), 555.

50. Christ's human nature.—True humanity, against Docetism, 34 (Apost. Fathers); 70 (St. Ignatius); 237 (Tertullian). Human infirmities, 149 (St. Irenaeus); 363 (St. Hilary). Clement of Alexandria's error, 190; and Origen, 214. Apollinaris' heresy mutilates Christ's humanity, 449. The School of Antioch, 300.

51. The Man-God.—The Word in Clement of Alex., 190; in St. Augustine, 676. The *same* Person is both God and Man : 149 (St. Irenaeus); 247 (Tertullian). Tendency of the School of Alexandria to stress this point, 298; contrary tendency of the Antiochians, 300. Diodorus' error, 454, and Theodore's, 459. Traditional communication of idioms maintains the unity, 34 (Apost. Fathers); 149 (St. Irenaeus); 351 (St. Athanasius); 399 (St. Epiphanius); 438'439 (Cappadocians). Consequences : Θεοτόκο , 400 (See Our Lady). Nestorian error, 460.

52. The Incarnation (union of the two natures) : 70 (St. Ignatius); 149 (St. Irenaeus); 150, "economy", 149 (St. Irenaeus). Tertullian, 247; Cassian, 595; St. Augustine, 677. Apollinaris' error, 449, and Theodore of Mops., 459. Motives of the Incarnation : See the *Redemption*, and *Names and Functions of Christ*.

53. The Redemption.—Gnostic error, 102. Traditional teaching : three theories, 352. Fundamental doctrine of *satisfaction* : 128 (St. Justin); 150 (St. Irenaeus);—recapitulation, 149;—190 (Clement of Alex.); 214 (Origen); 438 (St. Greg. Naz., St. Basil); 363, 545 (St. Hilary, St. Ambrose); St. Augustine, 677 (humility of God; satisfaction).—Theory of *union* : 352 (St. Athanasius); 439 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 545 (St. Hilary). Theory of the *rights of* the devil : 150 (St. Irenaeus); 214 (Origen); 439 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 545 (St. Ambrose). Rejected by St. Augustine, 677; see also 439 (St. Greg. Naz.).

54. Fruits of the Redemption.—See chiefly St. Irenaeus, 150 (reconciliation, divinisation, rebirth, etc...); Clement of Alex., 190 (ransom, rebirth...); St. Athanasius, 352 (divinisation, union with the Word, etc.); Cappadocians, 438 sq. *Universality* of the effects of the Redemption, 214 (Origen); 439 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 677 (St. Augustine); see also 692. *Grace*, fruit of the Redemption, see below, D.

55. Names and functions of Christ.—On the *names of* Christ, see 604 (Nicetas). On His *spiritual presence* in the Christian, see St. Ignatius, 71; Origen, 203; St. Ambrose, 544. On Christ *Saviour*, see the Redemption. Christ is the *revealer* of mysteries, 150 (St. Irenaeus); the *master* who instructs, 182, 190 (Clem. Alex.). Christ is a *doctor*, 190 (Clem. Alex.); 544 (St. Ambrose); 643 (St. Augustine). Christ, *model of humility*, 677. Christ is *deifier*, 150 (St. Irenaeus); 352 (St. Athanasius). Christ is the *tutor*, the *educator*, in the school of virtue, 181 (Clem. Alex.). Christ is the *Spouse* of chaste souls, 216 (Origen, In Cant.); 406 (Didymus); 429 (St. Greg. Nyssa); 543 (St. Ambrose);—Christ is the *Spouse* of the Church, His mystical body, 384 (St. Ephraem); 703 (St. Augustine). Christ is the vital *centre* of mankind : see August., *City of God*, [rjh, and 648-659.

56. The knowledge of Christ.—*The perfect knowledge of* Christ is the consequence of special supernatural graces; 73 (St. Ignatius); 152 (St. Irenaeus); 187 (Clement); 203 (Origen); 353 (St. Athanasius); 406 (Didymus); 687 (St. Augustine). See also Saint Augustine, contemplative, 662-665, 671, and also 23-24. This perfect knowledge and the spiritual maternity of Our Lady, 203 (Origen).

57. Our Lady.—*a*) The *Co-Redemptrix*, the new Eve, 128 (St. Justin); 151 (St. Irenaeus); advocate, 151 (St. Irenaeus). See chiefly Augustine, 678. *b*) The *Divine Motherhood*: in St. Ignatius, St. Justin, 128; St. Irenaeus, 151; Pierius, 279; St. Epiphanius, 400;

St. Augustine, 678. See also 203, 238, 485. Theodore of Mopsuestia's opposition, 456. *c) Perpetual Virginity, denied* by Tertullian, 238; Antidicomarianites, 400; Bonosus, 532; Helvidius, Jovinian, 577; *affirmed* more and more explicitly by St. Ignatius, 128; St. Justin, 128; St. Irenaeus, 151; St. Ephraem, 383; St. Epiphanius, 400; St. Ambrose, 532, St. Jerome, 577. *rf) Holiness:* St. Ephraem, 383; St. Ambrose, 543 (Mary, model and patron of virgins); St. Augustine, 678. St. J. Chrysostom's opinion, 485. *i) Mary's spiritual maternity* and the perfect knowledge of Christ, 203 (Origen). *l) Life and death of Mary* according to the apocryphal gospels, 161. See also St. Epiphanius, 400.

58. The Saints.—The first *anniversaries:* St. Polycarp, 74; the martyrs in general, 289. The great panegyrists of the fourth cent.: St. Ephraem, 381; St. Basil, 414; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. J. Chrysost., 479; St. Ambrose, 529; St. Augustine, 656. See also St. Paulinus, 553; Prudentius, 557. Lawfulness of *veneration of the saints*, 577, 583 (St. Jerome against Vigilantius).

59. Veneration... of saints: see *Saints*. Veneration of *images*, combated by Eusebius, 327; St. Epiphanius, 396, 400.

D) GRACE.

60. Man. *a) Origins of the soul:* Origen's opinion, 213; (*Creation ab eterno*), combated by St. Peter of Alex., 279; St. Methodius, 285. St. Augustine's opinion, 633, 679. *H) Nature of the soul:* Tertullian's conception, 238; Platonist conception of Clement of Alex., 190 (trichotomy); Nemesius, 496. Pure spirituality of the soul, according to Augustine, 624, 642.—*c) Immortality of the soul*, in the Apologists, 110; in St. Greg. Nyssa, 428; in St. Augustine, 642.

61. Freewill.—Firmly established by Origen (*Peri-Archon*), 199; Tertullian, 238; St. Methodius, 285; St. Ephraem, 383 (Image of God). See, in the fourth cent., the *adversaries of Manichaeism*, 369; especially the Cappadocians, 442. In the West see chiefly St. Augustine, explicit teaching against the Manichaeans, 624; unaffected by the theory of concupiscence, 633 (against Julian) or that of grace, 635, 685 (against the Semipelagians). St. Augustine distinguishes *freewill* from Adam's *libertas* (perfect liberty) 679, and from that of the perfect, 686, 688. Freewill and predestination, 692-693.

62. Primitive state. —The gifts of innocent man in St. Irenaeus, 152; St. Ephraem, 383; Cappadocians, 428, 442. See especially St. Augustine, 678.

63. The Fall.—*Original sin* according to Origen, 214; Reticus, 274; St. Ephraem, 383; Cappadocians, 442; Mark the Hermit, 508; Prudentius, 556; and chiefly St. Augustine, 631, 633, 634, and 679. *Effects of the Fall:* see the same authors and St. Irenaeus, 152; St. Greg. Nyssa, 428. *Concupiscence*, 633, 679, 702. See *Capital vices*.

64. Reparation: see above, *The Redemption*.

65. The Holy Ghost in man. Teaching of St. Irenaeus, 151-152 (Divine Person and created gift; grace; perfect gifts). See also St. Augustine: *De Spiritu et littera*, 630; the gifts, 687. Cassian, 600. Cappadocians, 437, 443, 445.

66. Sanctifying Grace.—*a*) *Sin* but not concupiscence is destroyed, 680 (St. Augustine). See *Redemption, Fall* (Original sin), *Baptism*. *b*) *Spiritual rebirth*: work of the Holy Ghost, 152 (St. Irenaeus); image of God restored, 680 (St. Augustine), *f*) *Divine life in the soul*: 152 (St. Irenaeus); 352 (St. Athanasius); 443 (Cappadocians); 508 (Mark the Hermit); and chiefly St. Augustine, 680. *rf*) *Presence of God in the soul*: the Christian is a God-bearer, 71 (St. Ignatius); a temple of God, 406 (Didymus); 544 (St. Ambrose). See *Names and Functions of Christ*.

67. Actual grace.—*a*) *Definition*, general division, 681 (St. Augustine). *b*) *Necessity*: 152 (St. Irenaeus); 214 (Origen); 268 (St. Cyprian); 383 (St. Ephraem); 443 (St. Greg. Naz.); 489 (St. J. Chrysost.); 544 (St. Ambrose); 578 (St. Jerome); 508 sq., (Cassian); and chiefly 629 sq. and 682 (St. Augustine). See *Pelagianism*.—*c*) *Gratuity*: against Cassian, 601-603; see St. Augustjne, 635-637 and 682. *d*) *Nature of actual grace*: see especially St. Gregory of Nazianzus, 443; St. J. Chrys., 489; St. Augustine, 683-686: more powerful grace than Adam's, 683; operating and co-operating, 684; not prejudicial to freewill, 685; extremely efficacious, 685. Heavenly delectation, 685.

68. The superior graces.—Special effects produced by them : *z*) *The (perfect) knowledge of Christ*; see these words. *z*) *Wisdom*, 152 (St. Irenaeus); 216 (Origen); 406 (Didymus); 686 (St. Augustine). *c*) *Contemplation or perfect prayer*, 599-600 (Cassian); 686-688 (St. Augustine); see also 662-664. *a*) *Spiritual understanding* of the mysteries and the Holy Scriptures: 152 (St. Irenaeus); 203 (Origen); 351, 353 (St. Athanasius); 406 (Didymus); 599-600 (Cassian); 669-671, 688 (St. Augustine). On the *gnosis* of Clem. Alex., see 186-187. *e*) *Perfect liberty*: 685, 688 (St. Augustine), *f*) *Peace*, 544 (St. Ambrose); 600 (Cassian); spiritual joy, 685, 688 (St. Augustine); see also 185 (Clem. Alex.). Sources of these graces: they are perfect gifts of the Holy Ghost: 152 (St. Irenaeus); 600 (Cassian); 687 (St. Augustine). See IH (B), *Mystical Theology*.

(*x*). Extraordinary graces.—*a*) *Charismata*, 45, 46, 47-48 (Didache); 373 (Apostolic Constitutions); 688 (St. Augustine). Montanist errors, 105. *z*) Extraordinary favours, *visions*, 688 (St. Augustine).

70. Mystical Theology.—*Definition*, 19, 21. Principal object, the superior graces, above. See HI (B), Ascetic THEOLOGY, especially *Christian perfection*. Mysticism, 30.

E) THE CHURCH.

71. Mystical notes of the Church.—The Church is "Charity", 69 (St. Ignatius). Christ is present in the Church, 69 (St. Ignatius), and also the *Spirit of God*, 147 (St. Irenaeus). She is a *mother*, 263 (St. Cyprian); the promise of eternal life, 538 (St. Ambrose). See chiefly St. Augustine, 704.

72. Ecclesiastical hierarchy.—*a*) A true hierarchy distinct from the charismatic gifts, 47-48 (Didache); 57-58 (St. Clement); 66-68 (St. Ignatius). See also 96 (Hermas); 189 (Clem. Alex.); 204 (Origen); Tertullian's Montanist error, 249. *b*) Hierarchy in three degrees: 57-59 (St. Clement); monarchical episcopate: 66-67 (St. Ignatius). Difficulties

in St. Jerome, 589-590; and in Ambrosiaster, 605. *c)* *Lower degrees of the hierarchy*, 287 (Didascalia); and 373 (Apostolic Constitutions). Laymen, 57, 67 (St. Clement), *d)* *Duties of the clergy*: see III (C), *Pastoral Theology*.

73. *The teaching Church*: see the *magisterium of the Church*, *bishops*, *councils*, *Fathers*, *Roman Church*.

74. *The Church, dispenser of grace*.—*a)* The Church is charged with the *means of sanctification*, 35 (Apostolic Fathers); 384 (St. Ephraem); see the *mystical notes of the Church*, *b)* She has the keeping of the *Sacraments*, by (St. Ignatius). St. Cyprian's exaggeration, 265: corrected by St. Optatus, 609, and St. Augustine, 627 and 709. *c)* *Power regarding Sacrament of Penance*, 86, 87, 93 (Hernias); 215 (Origen). Errors: see *Penance*. St. Cyprian's true teaching, 265; St. Ambrose, 546; St. Pacianus, 606; St. Augustine, 710.

75. *Holiness of the Church*.—The Church is holy as *dispenser of grace* (see these words); by her moral influence—see *Christian austerity*; by her mission as *guardian of morals*, 537 (St. Ambrose). See *the Church and the State*. In addition, the Church is a *society of saints* (Hermas), but of relative holiness in this world, 90 (Hermas, *Sim. j and f*). Donatist error, 390. Refuted by St. Optatus, 608, and St. Augustine, 626 and 704.

76. *Catholicity of the Church*.—The Catholic Church in St. Ignatius, 68; St. Cyprian, 263; St. Chrysostom, 493; St. Pacianus, 606; St. Optatus, 609; and chiefly St. Augustine, 626 (writings against Donatism); see also 704.

77. *Unity of the Church*.—Unity in general, shown by "charity", 68-69 (St. Ignatius); 96 (Hennas). *Doctrinal unity*, 127 (St. Justin); 147-148 (St. Irenaeus); 236 (Tertullian). See all the controversialists, especially St. Augustine, 627, 704, 710. Social, hierarchial, and *sacerdotal* unity, 263 (St. Cyprian); 493 (Chrysost.); 538 (St. Ambrose); 627, 704 (St. Augustine). See the adversaries of the errors regarding the Church (I, E).

78. *Apostolicity of the Church*. Apostolicity of the hierarchy and of teaching, 140 (Hegesippus); 147-148 (St. Irenaeus); 236 (Tertullian: *prescription*), 259 (St. Cyprian). Apostolicity finally based on the Apostolic See, 304, or on the *Roman Church*, which is the *Church of Peter*.

79. *The Roman Church*.—*d)* *Fundamental witnesses to its authority*: S. Clement: Peter and Paul at Rome; implicit manifestations of authority, 60; St. Ignatius: *praesidens caritatis*, 08-69; Hernias: 96; Hegesippus: apostolicity, 140; St. Irenaeus: apostolicity, unity and pre-eminence, 147-148; St. Victor causes councils to be held, 143 and 153; St. Dionysius of Corinth, 153; Abercius: sovereignty, 154; Origen: antiquity, 193; Tertullian: *Pontifex Maximus*, 228; St. Cyprian: Chair of Peter, centre of unity, 259; primacy, 264 (St. Cyprian's error, 304); St. Dionysius of Alex, and St. Dionysius of Rome: teaching authority, 277; anonymous (*De aleatoribus*): vicar of the Lord, 288. *b)* *Lawful progress*: 304. *Its causes*: 1. general causes, 292, 302; 2. heresies, 295; 3. dangers which threaten the unity of the Church arising from social and political environment, 293, from the division

of the Empire, 294, from the creation of patriarchates, 305. See *patriarchates*. c) Fourth century Popes: general outline, 306; St. Jules I, 339; Liberius, 333; St. Damasus, 513; first Decretals, 515; St. Innocent I, 516; his successors, 519. d) Historical facts confirming authority: general outline, 306. *Appeals to Rome*: St. Athanasius, 338-339; Council of Sardica, 339; Chrysostom, 470, 493, 517; Antoninus of Fussala, 519; Apiarius, 519. *Condemnations*: Apollinarius, 441, 450; Origen, 516, 575; Pelagius, 393, 518, 519, 631, 632. *Questions of the Schism of Antioch*, 514; 410, 418, 424, 441; 465; 538. e) *Fathers, doctrinal affirmations*: general outline, 308; Aphraates, 377; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Epiphanius, 399; Didymus, 440; St. Basil, 440; St. Greg. Naz., 440; Chrysost., 493, 493; St. Ambrose, 538; St. Jerome, 588; St. Augustine, 631, 705.

80. The Patriarchates.—Origin: the three fourth cent. Patriarchates, 305; Patriarchate of Constantinople, 305; ecclesiastical institutions, 305; results, 306. See 470, 518. Vicariate of Thessalonica, 518.

81. Discipline of the Church; duties of the clergy; see III (C), Pastoral Theology.

82. The Church and the State.—*General outline*; advantages and disadvantages of union, 293. *Independence of the Church*: Saint Athanasius' attitude, 341; St. Basil, 409, 440; St. J. Chrysostom, 467-468; St. Ambrose, 523-527, 528, 536-537; St. Augustine, 628, 706. *The Church as keeper of the moral law*: Chrysostom, 467-469; S. Ambrose, 537. *Chinch has right to State protection*: St. Ambrose, 537; St. Augustine, 629, 706.

F) THE SACRAMENTS.

83. Sacramente in general.—*The word*, 248 (Tertullian); 266- (St. Cyprian); 707 (St. Augustine). *General data*: 248 (Tertullian); 266 (St. Cyprian); 377 (Aphraates); 384 (St. Ephraem); 489 (St. J. Chrysostom); 546 (St. Ambrose); 577 (St. Jerome); 609 (St. Optatus); 627 and 707-708 (St. Augustine). *Christian initiation*: 128 (St. Justin); 241 (Tertullian); 267 (St. Cyprian); 377 (Aphraates); 521 (St. Ambrose).

84. Baptism.—See the *Didache*, 45, 49; St. Ignatius, 67; Hennas, 94; St. Justin, 128; St. Irenaeus, 150; Clem. Alex., 191; Origen, 215; Tertullian, 241-242; St. Cyprian, 260 (the controversy), 267 (teaching); St. Dionysius, 276; St. Cyril of Jerus., 368; Aphraates, 377; St. Basil, 407; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429 and the Cappadocians, 443; Chrysostom, 490; St. Optatus, 609; St. Augustine, 627, 708.

85. Confirmation.—See Clem. Al., 191; Tertullian, 248; St. Cyprian, 266; St. Cyril of Jer., 368; Aphraates, 377; St. J. Chrysostom, 490; St. Augustine, 710.

86. Holy Eucharist.—See *Didache*, 45, 49-51; St. Ignatius, 67, 71; St. Justin, 129; St. Irenaeus, 150; Abercius, 154; Pectorius, 154; Clement. Alex., 191; Origen, 215; Tertullian, 248; St. Cyprian, 266; St. Cyril of Jer., 368; Aphraates, 377; Cappadocians, 443; Chrysostom, 490; St. Ambrose, 546; St. Augustine, 709-710.

87. Penance.—Early data in the *Didache*, 45, 46, 49; and St. Clement, 59. *General data on penance in the 2nd cent.*, 88-90.

Teaching of Hermas; unity, necessity, efficacy, universality of penance, 90; how it is practised, 93. Origen's doctrine, 215; Hippolytus, 227-229; and especially Tertullian, 242-245; the *De poenitentia*, 242; the *De pudicitia*, 243; importance of the edict of Callistus, 244-245. See also Clement Alex., 180, 191; Novatian, 252; St. Cyprian, 257, 267; St. Greg. Thaum., 284; St. Basil, 415, 444; Chrysostom, 490; St. Ambrose, 533, 546. St. Pacian, 606; St. Augustine, 711. See *Novatianism*.

88. Extreme Unction.—See the *Euchologion Serapionis*, 371, and Aphraates, 377.

89. Holy Orders.—See above the *Ecclesiastical hierarchy*. St. Clement, 57; Tertullian, 248; St. Cyprian, 267; Aphraates, 377; Chrysostom, 475, 492; St. Innocent I, 505; St. Augustine, 708-709. On the priesthood of every Christian, see Clem. Alex., 188. See also III (C) *Pastoral Theology, dignity of the priest, duties of the priest*.

90. Marriage.—Episcopal approval required, 67 (St. Ignatius). Conjugal fidelity according to Hermas, 94. Unity of marriage according to Tertullian, 241. *Second marriages* discouraged in the East, 132 (Athenagoras); 444 (St. Greg. Naz.); 476 (St. Basil); 476 and 492 (St. J. Chrysost.); *Divorce* on account of adultery, 444 (St. Basil); 492 (St. J. Chrysost.); 652 (St. Augustine). *Lawfulness* of marriage: Montanist and Encratite errors, 106; teaching of Clement Alex., 183; St. J. Chrysost., 487; St. Ambrose, 532; St. Jerome, 577; and St. Augustine, 634, 652 and 710.

G) THE LAST THINGS.

91. The end of the world.—*Proximity* of the end of the world or the Parousia, according to the Didache, 46, 51; Hennas, 88; Montanus, 106; Tertullian, 249. See, on the last ends, Lactantius (*Institutions*, bk. vn), 272, and chiefly St. Augustine, (*City of God*, bks. xtx-xxxi), 650, 711. On Anti-Christ, Hippolytus, 222; Commodianus, 269; Lactantius, 272. The resurrection of the body, see St. Justin, 119; Athenagoras, 132; Hippolytus, 222; Tertullian, 238; *De recta in Deum fide*, 287. See Origen's teaching, 213, and against him, St. Peter of Alex., 279; St. Methodius, 285. The teaching of St. Greg. Nyssa, 428; and Rufinus, 566. The supposed reign of a thousand years: see *Millenarianism*. The Judgment: see the *Apocalypse of Peter*, 165; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Augustine, 712. Syrian teaching of the sleep of the soul, 377 (Aphraates).

92. Heaven.—Faith and aspiration of St. Ignatius in the possession of Christ through death, 71-72. Delay of the Beatific Vision according to St. Irenaeus, 153, and St. Ambrose, 547, against the Cappadocians, 447. *Apocalypse of Peter*, 165. Origen's teaching, 213. The parts of Heaven, 384 (St. Ephraem). Description of Heaven, 555 (Prudentius); 713 (St. Augustine). Heaven, vision of God, 712 (St. Augustine).

93. Hell.—Eternity of Hell: Origen's error, 213; orthodox teaching of Origen's adversaries, Aphraates, 377; St. Ephraem, 384; St. Basil, 447 (Against St. Greg. Nyssa, 447); St. Cyril of Jer., St. Chrysostom, 447. St. Ambrose's error, 547; Rufinus, 566; St. Jerome, 591. St. Augustine's sounder teaching, 712, *Mitigation* of torments, 447, 712. *Description* of Hell, *Apocalypse of Peter*, 165, and Prudentius, 555.

94. Purgatory. Prayers for the dead, 155 (Pectorius); St. Augustine (*Confessions*, ix) and *De cura*, 653, 712. See the History of Joseph, 162; St. Irenaeus' teaching, 153; St. Ambrose, 547. St. Augustine's teaching, 712.

III. PATRISTIC DATA CONCERNING CHRISTIAN LIFE.

A) MORAL THEOLOGY.

95. Patristic—Moral Theology in general.—The Apostolic Fathers, 33, 36. Orthodox Encratism in the 2nd cent., 107; see 94 (Hermas), same tendency in Tertullian, 239-241, and in some measure in St. Cyprian, 268. Different tendency in Clement of Alexandria, 179, 181, 183. Moral Theology in 4th cent. Fathers, 302, 699. See below, *General treatises*. St. Cyprian's moralism, 268; St. J. Chrysost., 472; St. Ambrose, 544; St. Augustine, 695-698. General notion, 30. See *Moralism*.

96. First little codexes of Christian morality.—The *Two Ways*: way of life, way of death, 45; reproduced in Ep. of Barnabas, 79. See also St. Clement, 56, 60, and Hermas (the precepts), 87. (The majority of moral writings deal with special subjects).

97. Theological virtues.—a) Faith: see *Scriptures* and *Tradition*. Necessity of confessing the faith, see *Martyrdom*. Faith and reason, see *Theology*. Foundations of faith, 644 (St. Augustine). Faith and the Gnosis, 202. b) Hope: vivacity of this hope, founded on faith, see St. Ignatius, 71-72; belief in the *Parousia*, 61; etc. See also apologetic regarding the *Resurrection*, *martyrdom*, etc. c) Charity: fundamental obligation, Didache, 45; St. Clement, 56; St. Ignatius, 71; Clement of Alex., 186; etc. See especially St. Augustine, 662, 698, 700. See also *prayer*, *martyrdom*, *Christian perfection*, d) On the Three Theological Virtues, see chiefly Clement Al., 185, and St. Augustine (*Enchiridion*), 650. See the *general treatises*, e) *Faith works through charity*, St. Jerome, 577; St. Augustine, 697, 701.

98. Prayer.—The Christian is religious: answer to Pagan calumnies, 114 (Ep. to Diognetus); 132 (Athenagoras); 234 (Tertullian), etc.; see *Apologetists*. The primitive prayer: Didache, 45; Sunday assembly, 46, 50; St. Clement, 57, 61. See *Liturgy*. Treatises on prayer: Origen, 200, 217; Tertullian, 241; St. Cyprian, 257, 268; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. Nilus, 508. *Necessity of prayer*; in addition to these treatises, see St. Irenaeus, 152; St. Ambrose, 543; St. Augustine, 703. See also 682. *Perfect prayer*: see Clement Al., 185; Cassian, 599; St. Augustine, 662-664; 686-688. Prayer and study in the Augustinian method, 670. Prayer for our neighbour is useful. Hernias (Sim. of the Elm), 92. Prayer for the dead, *Purgatory*.

<y). Martyrdom.—The *desire* of martyrdom: St. Irenaeus, Ep. to the Romans, 65, 72. See also second cent, apologetic literature, 97; especially St. Justin, 116. Exhortation to martyrdom: Origen, 200; Tertullian, 239 (*ad martyres*); St. Cyprian, 262, 268 (letters); neither

apostasy nor provocation : Clement Al., 183; St. Cyprian, 257, 262. Tertullian's contrary attitude, 239 (*Scorpiace, Defuga*).

too. Apostasy.—Various *dangers* mentioned by Tertullian, 240 (circus, the army, trades). Various *forms* of apostasy, 247. Absolution from apostasy, see *Penance*.

tot. Patience.—Virtue recommended by Tertullian, 240 (see 232); St. Cyprian, 257; St. Dionysius Al., 275; St. J. Chrysost., 477 (letters); Cassian, 598; St. Augustine, 653. Providential role of suffering, 120 (St. Justin); 114 (Ep. to Diognetus); 477 (Chrysostom).

102. Christian austerity.—Encratism of fervent Christians, 91. Ilermas, see 107. Fasting: Hermas (Sim., 5), 87; Tertullian, 241. Monastic austerity, see the *Monastic spirit*. Moral reform, see Hermas, 90 sq.; Origen, 200; St. Cyprian, 255-256. Christians are the soul of the world, 114. *Apologetic importance* of Christian life: Aristides, 111; St. Justin, 114; Athenagoras; Minucius Felix, 137. St. Augustine against Manichaeism, 622-623.

103. Virginité.—Advice of Pseudo-Clement, 81; to virgins, Origen, 492, 217; Tertullian, 240; St. Cyprian, 257. St. Methodius' teaching (The Banquet), 286; Basil of Ancyra, 318; St. Athanasius, 347; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; Chrysostom, 476, 487; St. Ambrose, 532, 543; St. Jerome, 577, 592; Nicetas of R., 604; St. Augustine, 652. See also *Monachism*.

104. The state of Marriage. *Duties*: St. Augustine, 652 (*De bono conjugali*). See *Marriage*. Sanctification of the family, Chrysostom, 487.

105. Modesty.—Advice of Clement of Alex. (The Tutor), 181-182; Tertullian, 246. Moderation in the use of riches, Clement Al., 180; St. Methodius, 286; Chrysostom, 487.

106. Charity.—Duties of Christian charity, 45, 46 (Didache); 56 (St. Clement); 79 (11 *Clem.*), 87 (Hermas). Through their charity Christians become "imitators of God", 114 (*Ep. to Diog.*); 133 (Athenagoras). Exhortations to almsgiving, St. Cyprian, 260; to fly envy, 262, 268; St. Basil, 408. Love of the poor: St. Greg. Naz., 422; St. Chrysost., 479, 487; St. Ambrose, 521, 542; St. Augustine, 622, 702 (works of mercy).

107. Truth.—According to St. Augustine it is the chastity of the mind 652. Augustinian teaching on lying, 651-656, 699; opposed to that of Clement of Al., St. Hilary, Cassian, 596. Simplicity and veracity, 87 (Hermas).

108. Virtue.—Its excellence, 498 (St. Isidore). Division of the *theological virtues*, see above; the four Cardinal Virtues, 542 (St. Ambrose); 699 (St. Augustine). Various virtues: see chiefly the *homilies*, the *general treatises* on moral theology, and writings on *asceticism*.

109. General treatises on moral theology.—General outlines of Christian morality; Clement of Al., 181-184 (*Trilogy*); St. Basil, 412 (*Moralia*); St. Ambrose, 531, 540 (*De officiis ministrorum*); St. Augustine, 623 (*De moribus*), and 650-654. God, last end, 541 (St. Ambrose), happiness of man, 698 (St. Augustine). The law, 698 (St. Augustine!). Duty, 541 (St. Ambrose).

no. Sin.—The three unpardonable crimes according to Tertullian, 243. Cenerai study on the question, see *Penance*. *Crimina mortalia* and *culpae mortales*, 215 (Origen); *delicta graviora* and *leviora* (St. Ambrose), 546; *crimina ζηΑ peccata* (Pacianus). Final distinction of *mortal* and *venial* sins by St. Augustine, 699. Forgiveness of sins: see *Penance*.

B). ASCETIC THEOLOGY.

in. The Degrees of Perfection.—Later classical division of the *Three Ways*, 21. Two classes of Christians according to the Alexandrians, 181, 182, 185 (Clement); 202, 216 (Origen). Various classifications of St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; Cassian, 597, 599; and chiefly St. Augustine, 701.

112. The Spiritual Combat.—Tendency of the Apostolic Fathers, 36; see chiefly the IInd Ep. of Clement, 80; see also the Two Ways in the Didache, 45, and the Ps. Barnabas, 78, or Hermas, 94. Warlike literature of the 2nd cent., 97. Epistle to Dognetus; the flesh and the spirit, 114. Christ (Tutor), is a general, 181 (Clement of Alex.). The struggle against the devil and the world: Peri-Archon, 199 (Origen). The combat, *monastic conception* of the spiritual life: 383 (St. Ephraem); 486 (St. Chrysostom); 508 (St. Nilus); 509 (Oriental monks); 593 (St. Jerome); 597 (Cassian). St. Augustine, 703. Struggle carried on against the *devil* or *vices* (See these words). Poetical description by Prudentius, 556.

113. The Devil.—The angel of temptation according to Hennas, 96; Origen (Peri-Archon), 199; St. Athanasius (Life of St. Antony), 354; the Oriental monks, 509; and 596 (Cassian). See also Chrysostom, 477.

114. The capital vices.—Various classifications: the ways of death according to the Didache, 45; the 12 vices according to Hermas, 87, 92. Monastic classical division: *eight vices*, 510. See also 383 (St. Ephraem); 507 (Evagrius); 508 (St. Nilus); 595, 597 (Cassian). Saint Augustine and the threefold concupiscence, 702, or self love, 707. See the *Fall*.

115. The Spiritual Arms.—The most recommended arms: prayer, 511; fasting, 511; renunciation, penance, mortification, 598. Saint Ambrose and *virginity*, 543 (see this word). *On the study* of the Scriptures, see St. Jerome, 593; St. Augustine, 703; on the study of theology, see 407 (St. Basil). On the *Christian virtues*, see III (A), *Moral Theology*.

116. Monachism.—*In the East*: general outline, 499-512. Anachoretic life, 502. Coenobitic life: Egyptian rules; Rule of St. Basil, 407, 412. *In the West*, Cassian, 595; St. Augustine, 621. *Monastic writings*: Apophthegmata, 505 sq. Authors of treatises: various, 505-509; St. Basil, 412; St. Greg. Nyssa, 429; St. Chrysostom, 473, 486, 488; St. Isidore, 498; St. Ambrose, 543; St. Jerome, 593; Cassian, 597-601; St. Augustine, 703. *Monastic virtues*, see above, *Moral Theology*, and the *Monastic spirit*.

117. The Monastic Spirit.—General character: struggle, effort; see above, the *Spiritual Combat*. Absolute *detachment*, 474 (Chrysost); 593 (St. Jerome); 598 (Cassian); 622 (St. Augustine). Love of solitude.

217 (Origen). See all the monastic writings. On life in community, see *Monachism* (Coenobitic). *Monastic austerities*, 511, 593 (St. Jerome); 598 (Cassian); 622 (St. Augustine). *Work*, 511; *Euchite error*, 303. St. Basil, 407; St. Jerome, 593; St. Augustine, 622, 703. *Prayer*: see *spirit of prayer*.

118. *The Spirit of Prayer*.—The soul of monachism : 511, 598-600 (Cassian); St. Augustine : the *contemplative*, *i>bi-CAV*, see also, 640-643, 686-688. See also Clem. Alex., 184. The degrees of prayer according to Cassian, 599. *Character of monastic prayer*, see the Introduction, 28. See *Prayer*.

119. *Christian Perfection*.—Consummation of the asceticism; *various descriptions*, according to the different viewpoints. *Peace*: harmony of the three elements in man, 152 (St. Irenaeus); *Apatheia*, 185-186 (Clem. Alex.); 216 (Origen); 405 (Didymus); 512 (monks); 543 (St. Ambrose); 598 (Cassian); (S. Augustine), 662 sq., 688. *Charity*: God-bearer, 186 (Clem. Al.); unites to God, 216 (Origen); virtue of God, 597 (Cassian); makes God possessed, 620, 653, 701 (St. Augustine). *Wisdom*, see chiefly Origen, 216; Didymus, 405; St. Augustine, 688; contemplation, 686-688 and 666-668; see also, 512 (monks); 600-601 (Cassian); 486 (Chrysost.). *Philosophy* (spiritual perfection), 472, 484, 486. See 188 (Clem. Alex.). On the Alexandrian Gnosis, see 185-189. On the understanding of the Scriptures, see *Exegesis*. Effects of wisdom: perfect rectitude of judgment, 152 (St. Irenaeus). *Union with God, with Christ*: St. Ignatius, 72; Origen, 217; Didymus, 405; St. Ambrose, 544; St. Augustine, 686, 701, 703. See the *perfect knowledge of Christ*. *Submission to the Holy Ghost*, 152 (St. Irenaeus); 787, 697 (St. Augustine); see also 599 (Cassian). On *Spirituality* (or dogmatic or moral teaching on perfection), see chiefly II (D) *Grace*; III (A) *Moral Theology*; III (B) *Ascetic Theology*.

120. *Perfect activity*.—The *officium perfectum* of Saint Ambrose, 541. *Christian perfection and classical culture in the fourth cent.* Fathers, 292, and 386; Cappadocians, 445; St. Augustine, 660. *Action and contemplation*: see chiefly St. Ignatius, 72; St. Athanasius, 354; St. Chrysostom, 463; St. Augustine, 664, 697, 703.

C PASTORAL THEOLOGY. DISCIPLINE.

121. *Dignity of the Priest*.—Subject especially developed in St. Ephraem, 383; St. Greg. Naz., 422; Chrysostom, 475; St. Jerome, 586. See *Holy Orders*.

122. *Duties of the Priest*.—Duties of the bishop according to St. Ignatius, 67; Didascalia, 287; Chrysostom, 475; St. Ambrose, 541 (*De officiis*); St. Augustine, 659 (various letters). On the training of the Apostles by Christ, see Origen, 203.

123. *Preaching*.—Qualities required in those who speak of God, 421 (St. Greg. Naz.). *Laws of Christian eloquence*, according to Chrysostom, 475, and St. Augustine, 653, 658. See also, 542 (St. Ambrose). *Great models*: St. Basil, 411; St. Greg. Naz., 421; St. Greg. Nyssa, 430; Chrysostom, 481-483; St. Ambrose, 522; St. Augustine, 657-659. See *Homilies*.

124. Disciplinary works.—Chief disciplinary works mentioned *Didache*, 43 sq.; *the Apostolic Tradition*, 225; *Didascalia*, 287; divers collections of *canons*, 372; Apostolic Constitutions, 373. Letters of the Oriental Fathers, called *Canonical Epistles*: 279 (St. Peter of Alex.); 283 (St. Greg. Thaum.); 415 (St. Basil); 429 (St. Greg. Nyssa). *Decretal letters* of the Popes, 515 sq. Five pseudo-decretals, 53.

IV.—ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO THE DOCTRINAL TABLES'.

A

Activity (perfect), n. 120.
Adoptianism, n. 32.
Alogi, n. 37.
Angels, n. 40.
Antichrist, n. 91.
Antidicomarianites, n. 33.
V Apollinarianism, n. 33.
Apologetics, I. D, page 725.
Apologetics in the 3rd cent, n. 27.
Apologetics in the 4th cent, ll. 28.
Apologetics against the Jews, n. 29.
Apologetists, n. 26.
Apostasy, n. too.
Apostolicity of the Church, n. 78.
Arianism, n. 32.
Arms (spiritual), n. 115.
Ascetic theology, III. B, p. 738.
Augustinism, n. 8.
Austerity (Christian), n. to2.

B

Baptism, n. 104.
Body (Resurrection of), n. 91.

C

Canon of the Scriptures, n. 11.
Capital vices, n. 114.
Catholicity of the Church, n. 76.
Charity, 97, n. 106.
Christ, II. C, page 711.
Christian life (Patristic data on)
III, page 736.

Church, II. E, page 732.
Church, dispenser of Grace, n. 74.
Church (teaching, n. 73.)
Church and State, n. 82.
Church (Roman), n. 79.
Clergy (Duties of), n. 81.
Codexes of Christian morality (first little), n. 96.
Combat (spiritual), n. 112.
Commentaries on the Scripture, n. 16.
Communication of idioms, n. 51.
Confirmation, n. 85.
Consubstantiality, n. 46.
Contemplation, n. 119.
Controversy, n. 130.
Controversialists, I. D, page 725.
Councils, n. 124.
Creation, n. 40.

D

Data (general), I. A, page,
Degrees of Perfection n. 111.
Devil n. 109.
Dignity of the Priest, 112.
Disciplinary works, n. 124.
Discipline of the Church, n. 81.
Divinity of Christ, n. 49.
Docetism, n. 33. v
Doctrine, n. 1.
Dogma, n. 2.
Donatism, n. 34.
Duty, n. 109.
Duties of the clergy, n. 112.
Duties of the priest, n. 122.

1 The figures refer to the numbers of the preceding Doctrinal Table, and not to the page, unless otherwise stated.

E

Encratism, n. 135.
 End (the last), n. tog.
 End of the world, n. 81.
Errors (doctrinal) I. E, page 725.
 Eucharist, n. 86.
 Euchites, n. 35.
 Exegesis, n. 13.
 Extreme Unction, n. 88. -

F

Faith (Patristic data relative to),
 7Z, page 727.
 Faith (Virtue of), n. 97.
 Fall of man, n. 63.
 Fathers, n. 25.
 Free-will in man, n. 61.
 Fruits of the Redemption, n. 55.
 Functions of Christ, n. 54.

G

Gnosis (Alexandrian), n. 119.
 ^Gnosticism, n. 31.
God, II. A, page 727.
 Goodness of God, n. 39.
 Grace (actual), n. 67.
 Grace (sanctifying), n. 66.
 Graces (extraordinary), n. 69.
 Graces (superior), n. 68.
 Grace (Church dispenser of), n. 74.

H

Heaven, n. 92.
 Hell n. 93.
 Hierarchy (ecclesiastical) n. 72.
 Holiness of the Church, n. 15.
 Holy Ghost, n. 47.
 Homilies, n. 15.
 Humanity of Christ, n. 50.

I

Impassibility (Divine), n. 39.
 Incarnation, n. 52.
 Initiation (Christian), n. 83.
Introduction to Theology (Patristic data for), I, page 722.

J

Judaeo-Christianity, n. 33.
 Judgments, n. 91.

L

Law, n. 109.
 Laxism, n. 35.
 Luciferianism, n. 34.
 Lying, n. 107.

M

Magisterium of the Church, n. 19.
 Manichaeism, n. 31.
 Marcionism, n. 31.
 Marriage, n. 90.
 Mary, n. 57.
 Martyrdom, n. 99.
 Millenarianism, n. 36.
 Mithraism, n. 31.
 Modalism, n. 32.
 Modesty, n. 105.
 Monachism, n. 116.
 Monarchianism, n. 32.
 Monastic spirit, n. 117.
 Montanism, n. 35, 36.
 Moral teaching, n. 3.
Moral theology, III. A, page 736.
 Morality (general treatises on),
 n. 109.
 Morality (first little codexes of),
 n. 96.
 Moral teaching (Patristic in general), n. 95.
 Moralism, n. 4.
 Mysticism, n. 70.
 Mystical theology, n. 70.

N

Names of Christ, n. 55.
 Nestorianism, n. 33.
 Notes (mystical of the Church),
 n. 71.
 Novatianism, n. 34.

O

Orders (Holy), n. 89.
 Origenism, n. 36.
 Original sin, n. 63.
 Origins of theology, n. 7.

P

Panegyrist, n. 58.
 Parousia, n. 91.

Pastoral theology, *III. C*, page 739.
 Patience, η. τοι.
 Patriarchates, n. 80.
 Patristicism, n. 32.
 Patrology, n. 25.
 Pelagianism, n. 35.
 Penance, n. 87.
 Perfection (degrees of), n. ut.
 Perfection (Christian), η. i ic.
 Persons (the Three), η. 43.
 Philosophy, η. <).
 Photinism, η. 32.
 Pneumatomachi, η. 32.
 Prayer, η. 98.
 Prayer (Spirit of), η. 118.
 Preaching, n. 123.
 Predestination, n. 123.
 Priest (dignity of), n. 121.
 Priest (duties of), n. 122.
 Priscillianism, n. 31.
 Providence, n. 94.
 Purgatory, n. 94.

Q

Quartodecimans, n. 97.

R

Redemption, n. 53, 54.
 Reparation, n. 64.
 Resurrection of body, n. 91
 Rites, n. 21.
 Roman Church, n. 79.

S

Sabellianism, n. 32.
Sacraments, *II. F*, page 734.
 Sacraments in general, n. 83.
 Saints, n. 58.
 Schools, n. 8.
Scriptures, *I. B*, page 723.
 Scriptures (source of teaching),
 n. 10.
 See (Apostolic), n. 23.
 Semipelagianism, n. 35.
 Senses (Biblical), n. 23.
 Simplicity (Divine), n. 39.
 Sin, n. too.

Spirit (The, in man), n. 65.
 Spirit of prayer, n. 118.
 Spirit (monastic), n. 117.
 Spiritual combat, η. 112.
 Spiritual arms, n. 115.
 State (Church and), n. 82.
 State of marriage, n. 104.
 State (primitive of man), n. 62.
 Subordinationism, n. 45.
 Summas of theology (first), n. 6.
 Syncretism (religious), n. 31.

T

Tendencies (doctrinal), n. 8.
 Text of the Scriptures, n. 12.
 Theological virtues, n. 97.
 Theology, n. 5.
 Theology (Origins of), n. 7.
Theology (Ascetic), *III. B*, page 738.
Theology (Moral) *III. A*, page 736.
Theology (Mystical), n. 70.
Things (the last) *II. G*, page 735.
Tradition, *I. C*, page 724.
 Tradition in the Fathers, n. 17.
 Tradition (Oral), n. 18.
 Treatises (General, of morality),
 n. 109.
Trinity, *II. B*, page 728.
 Trinity, n. 48.
 Truth, n. 107.
 Truth of God, n. 39.

U

Unitarianism, n. 32.
 Unity of God, n. 39.
 Unity of the Church, n. 77.

V

Value of the Scriptures, n. 14.
 Virtue, n. 108.
 Virtues (theological), n. 97.
 Vicariate, n. 80.
 Vices (Capital), n. 114.
 Virginity, n. 103.

W

Word (The) n. 44.

$\beta_{\pi\kappa}$ $\Lambda; \dots$ I I $?$ $st\ air$